

THE
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.
New Series.

Vol. I.]

JANUARY, 1827.

[No. I.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE BIBLE AS CONNECTED WITH ITS PRECEPTS.

THE doctrines of the Bible are statements of facts. For example, the doctrine of the trinity is the statement of a fact respecting the mode of the divine existence. The doctrine of God's eternal purposes is the statement of a fact respecting the divine administration. The doctrine of human depravity is the statement of a fact respecting the character of man.

The statement of any historical fact may be called, in the technical language of theology, a doctrine. Theologians have selected some of the most important and peculiar facts stated in the Bible, and given them, by way of eminence, the appellation of *doctrines*: thus the facts stated in the Bible respecting the lost condition of man, and the gospel method of saving him, are appropriately denominated, the *Evangelical Doctrines*.

These doctrines of the Bible are a divinely authorized statement of facts; and, in many instances, of facts of which we could not be certified in any other way than by revelation. As a mere subject of knowledge, therefore, these facts are most worthy of our attention. But, in addition to this circumstance, these facts, or doctrines, lay the foundation for all the precepts of the Bible,—making the precepts intelligible and obligatory. Unless, for instance, the doctrines

respecting the being and attributes of God are true, the precepts to fear, and love, and obey him, are not only not obligatory, but they are without meaning. So if the doctrines of human sinfulness, and of an atonement for sin by the death of Christ, are not true, there is no ground on which to enjoin the precepts, to repent, and believe, and hope for pardon. In this way we might enumerate all the leading doctrines of the Bible, and find that there are corresponding precepts, which, without these doctrines, are, in every respect, nugatory; and we may safely say, that if the doctrines of the Bible, considered as a statement of facts, are not true, then the precepts of the Bible, considered as a system of rules for regulating the conduct of men, are neither obligatory, nor even intelligible.

But the doctrines of the Bible are not important on this ground merely, that they make the precepts intelligible and obligatory;—these doctrines give the precepts all their *efficiency*. On the ground before taken, the precepts of the Bible, if the doctrines are not true, appear like the enactments of a legislative assembly, made on the hypothesis that a certain class of beings and facts exist, when, in reality, no such beings and facts ever did exist, or were supposed to exist, or expected ever to exist. There evidently would be no real or conceivable reason for such enactments. On the ground which I now take, the pre-

cepts of the Bible, if the doctrines are not true, appear like the laws of such an assembly promulgated without being accompanied by a penalty, or any other suitable inducement to obedience. In the former view, the precept enjoining repentance, for example, might be the subject of contemplation ; but if it was not preceded by the doctrines that God exists as a lawgiver, and that man has transgressed the divine law ;—or, if there was not previously a knowledge of these two facts,—the precept would be unintelligible :—and if the natural claims of God to the love and obedience of man were not previously seen, the precept would appear unreasonable. Now, in any case, to secure obedience to a precept, something more is necessary than merely that the precept have a meaning ; and in a case where the person to whom the precept is given is so averse to the duties enjoined by it, as man is to the duties enjoined by the precepts of the Bible, something more is necessary for the purpose of securing this obedience, than merely that the precepts be reasonable. The appeal to man's understanding is unsuccessful : You must, therefore, present something which shall operate as a motive by appealing to his feelings. This power of operating on the feelings of man is that in which the great importance of the doctrines of the Bible is most clearly manifest. It arises from the adaptation of these doctrines to the nature of man, and to the particular precepts which they are designed to enforce.

Man has a susceptibility of being affected by goodness, exhibited in acts of kindness done to himself, and by sufferings endured for his sake. This susceptibility is appealed to by the doctrines of the Gospel in such language as this ; “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have

everlasting life.”—“God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.” Now this fact that God first loved him, and has manifested his love in so affecting a manner, cannot but be a powerful motive to induce man to obey the precept which enjoins love to God. Man may also be powerfully affected by objects which are placed in prospect before him, and which he naturally desires. This susceptibility is appealed to in the doctrines of the gospel. The happiness of heaven is represented as beyond what eye hath seen, or ear heard, or heart conceived. The nature of this happiness is summarily described by saying, that when Christ shall appear the Christian shall be like him, for he shall see him as he is. Such a hope leads a man, in the language of the Bible, to purify himself,—both by the nature of the objects on which it fixes his mind, and by making him strive to avoid every thing which would prevent his attaining to this blessedness. But the doctrine which is adapted most directly to enforce all the precepts of the Bible, and to operate as the most solemn penalty for all transgression, is the doctrine of a future punishment.

These doctrines of a future state of reward and punishment cannot fail to give efficiency to the precepts which are to regulate the conduct of men. They make a twofold appeal to his interest, and thus, by awakening his hope and fear, they dissuade and deter him from sin.—The doctrine which teaches the love of Christ in suffering for sinners, is no less efficient in producing a hatred of sin. It is an apprehension of the goodness of God, and a familiarity with it, in all its aspects, which leads men to repentance.

But in order to make the doctrines of the Bible produce their proper effect, *they must not be viewed as matters of mere speculation.*

God does not reveal facts to men which he designed should be merely *known*, as a gratification to curiosity ; and of which it is of little consequence whether we have a correct notion or not. God doubtless designed that all which he has revealed should have an important influence on the character and conduct of men. And surely, if there is any one part of the Bible farther removed from being a matter of mere speculation than another, that part is the evangelical doctrines. The very object and tendency of them is to give man correct and practical views of certain great facts which are of the nearest personal concern to him. They are to give him a proper knowledge of his relations and destinies ; to give him such knowledge, and create in him such a state of feeling, that the precepts shall seem intelligible, and proper, and obligatory ; and to put his mind, in every respect, in such a state, as to understand, and joyfully obey them. The essence of all religion in man lies in the exercise of proper affections ; but what is to produce these affections ? The precepts cannot do it. The precept to love God, though issued with ever so much authority, has no tendency to excite love to him. This love can be excited by some doctrine only, that is, some statement of facts respecting what God is, or what he has done. If, then, men would be instructed in the truths of religion, they must study and understand the doctrines :—if they would have the proper religious affections, they must study and become familiar with the doctrines :—if they would render any thing more than outward and formal obedience, they must prepare their minds for a hearty and spiritual service, by bringing the great and affecting doctrines of the Bible to bear on their own feelings.

The reason why men do not like to meditate on the doctrines, and to have them pressed on their view,

probably is, that they do not like to feel the binding force of the precepts. The precepts of the Bible, viewed aside from the doctrines, may appear a very pleasant matter of speculation, because the man feels under no special obligation to obey them, farther than is convenient and agreeable, and fears no serious consequences from disobedience : but if a man is told by the doctrines of the Bible that all his moral affections are unholy, that all his conduct springs from wrong principles ; that for this he is so guilty, that God judges him deserving of eternal punishment, and cannot pardon him without the atonement effected by the death of his well beloved Son,—the whole matter assumes the aspect of something else than speculation. His case becomes critical ; and the precepts to repent and believe, involving an increased amount of meaning, gather importance, and bear with weight on his conscience ; and he sees that he cannot disobey them but at his utmost peril. He therefore excludes them from his view ; and calls them speculative, just as if this neglect, and the application of this epithet, would change their nature, or their eternal importance to him.

In order that the doctrines may produce their proper effects, *they should be viewed just as they are stated in the Bible.* They should be thoroughly understood, in all their practical meaning, and personal bearing : for just in proportion as the notion entertained of a particular doctrine is defective in any of its parts, or is different in any of its parts from what it should be, in the same proportion will the reasonableness and urgency of the precepts which that doctrine was designed to enforce, be diminished. Different modifications of the same general doctrine may produce different degrees of that which the precepts enjoin : for instance, representations that man is, to a cer-

tain extent, a sinner, may correspond to a precept which enjoins a certain amount of repentance, and may produce it, while nothing but the doctrine which represents a total unholiness of the affections, will correspond to the precept, make yourselves a new heart, and be created anew in Christ Jesus. If, then, the doctrines of the Bible are so modified as to become of less efficiency, the precepts of the Bible must be so modified as to become less strict: otherwise the doctrines will be found inadequate to secure obedience. Hence the softening or concealing the affecting doctrines of the Bible is always followed by a lowering of the standard of morals; and we find that all those classes of Christians who do not bring fully and prominently into view the great distinguishing doctrines of Christianity—as well as all pagan moralists—have always failed to make their systems take strong hold of the human mind, or to do much towards reforming men. The doctrines and precepts of the Bible have so exact an adaptation to each other, as to prove the divine authority of them both. The power of these doctrines to excite moral emotion corresponds to the resistance to be overcome in the human mind before men will obey the precepts.

A conclusion to which I think this view legitimately leads, is, that *the doctrines of the Bible ought to be preached.* They ought to be preached with *great care*,—lest a wrong notion be given to the character and government of God,—respecting the character and condition of man, and the way of his being saved. They ought to be preached *fully and plainly.* God, who directed the doctrines of the Bible to be stated there, knew what was the character of man on whom they were designed to operate;—he knew also what sort and amount of influence these doctrines were

adapted to exert; and he undoubtedly stated just so many doctrines, and doctrines of just such a moral power, as would secure obedience to the precepts of the Bible, and effect the proper change in the character of man. If, therefore, these doctrines are indispensable, and there is no superfluity of moral power in them, then if all of them are not preached, and in all their strength, the proper change will not be effected in the human character, and men may not be saved, and their blood will be required at the preacher's hand.

The doctrines, when preached, ought to be presented in such a light, and to be so connected with the precepts, as to produce the greatest possible effect in securing obedience. The truths of the Bible do not possess such superfluous power over the minds of men, that we can well afford to have it diminished by presenting these truths in an unimpressive attitude. The object of preaching is not to fill the mind with insulated conceptions of doctrinal facts—broken off from each other, and from the precepts which are to regulate human conduct; neither is it, on the other hand, to proclaim precepts which contain, in themselves, nothing to show their propriety, or to enforce them. Both these courses lead to error. The former tends to make men suppose that all religion consists in having certain intellectual conceptions, which may have no more influence on the moral character of man than has a conception of the relations and movements of the solar system. The latter, by leaving out the doctrines, on the ground of which the precepts are issued, tends to make men think that the precepts of the Bible are arbitrary; or at least, that there is no special propriety in them, and no very momentous consequences depending on obeying, or disobeying them, and leaves men therefore to

do either, as convenience, or inclination, may dictate.

We not unfrequently hear some important doctrine of the Bible, and see it when it is finished, standing alone and bare. The doctrine is neither held up as the reason for any precept, nor as the sanction to it. It neither excites feeling, nor secures obedience. It is perfectly uninviting in its aspect, and barren of results. Again we hear a sermon on some important Christian duty. The precepts enjoining that duty are arrayed before the mind with proper explanation and method; but we find them uninteresting and powerless, because the doctrines which make those precepts reasonable and enforce them, are left out of view. Perhaps the doctrine of the former sermon was the very one which, by being introduced in connexion with the precept of the latter, would have made it appear most reasonable, clothed it with the highest interest, and secured a delightful obedience. Or perhaps that doctrine was the very one which constituted the most appalling sanction to that precept, so that if the doctrines and precepts of these two sermons could have been brought together, and made to take hold of each other by some obvious and connecting link, they would have been full of reason and energy; but as they were, they stood apart and unrelated, so that the well built logic which explained and defended the one, and the didactic and passionate oratory which enforced the other, were worse than in vain,—because they left that appearing distant and unimportant, which ought to affect man most, and that appearing in no way obligatory, which ought to be his chosen and constant guide.

The doctrines of human sinfulness and of the divine purposes are often so exhibited that the spirit of the one seems misanthropy, and that of the other, fatalism.

VOL. I.—No. I.

The former does not make man humble, nor make him feel his need of divine influences, or of the atonement; the latter does not make him feel his dependence, nor lead him to resignation, nor encourage him to work out his salvation with fear and trembling.

It would be an interesting and profitable task, to trace out, somewhat at large, the manner in which Paul interweaves the doctrines and precepts with each other. I will present a few instances. It is worthy of notice that throughout his epistles the great and almost uniform doctrinal motive by which he enforces his precepts and exhortations, is, the death of Christ to save men from sin. This he calls “the wisdom of God and the power of God.” One instance of his skill in using this doctrine is in his epistle to the Romans. After having, in the first eleven chapters, exhibited the guilty and wretched condition of man, as a sinner, and the great love of God manifested in giving up his Son to suffering and death to make a propitiation for sin, he begins the twelfth chapter with an appeal which is absolutely irresistible;—“I beseech you, therefore, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.” So in his first epistle to the Corinthians, vi. 20. “Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price, therefore, glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God’s.”

Another instance where Paul interweaves the doctrines of the gospel with the precepts he is inculcating, is found at the close of the fourth and beginning of the fifth chapter to the Ephesians, where in one of his unrivalled strains of tender Christian pathos, he enjoins a forgiving temper. “Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption. Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil

speaking, be put away from among you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you. Be ye therefore followers of God as dear children, and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor."

He exhibits a similar skill in connecting the doctrines with the precepts, when, after urging the Corinthian Christians, in his eighth and ninth chapters to them, to contribute liberally to the relief of the distressed churches of Judea, and commending them for what they had done, and telling them what was expected of them, he closes his appeal to their pious generosity with a stroke of Christian policy which shows well that he had felt the power of the gospel doctrines on his own heart, and witnessed their power on others, and says, "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." (2. Cor. ix. 15.) Again, (2. Cor. viii. 9,) in the same connexion and for the same purpose, he says,—“Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.”

ON THE PROPER ANSWER TO BE GIVEN TO THE INQUIRY, “WHAT MUST I DO TO BE SAVED?”

IN answering an inquiry of such momentous import, we can have no other safe guide than the word of God. The suggestions of theoretical speculation may be fatal to the inquirer, and bring guilt upon him who, in reliance on his own wisdom, undertakes to point the way to heaven. “Son of man,” says God to Ezekiel, “I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word

from *my* mouth, and warn them from *me*.”*

I shall endeavour, then, to obtain directly from the scriptures, the proper answer to be given to the inquiry proposed. There is no one form of words, in which the directions are uniformly given. The answer to the jailor is very simple; “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.” Here, the only duty mentioned is *faith in Christ*. But in other passages, various Christian graces are enjoined, in giving directions to sinners.—When on the day of pentecost multitudes “were pricked in their heart, and said to the apostles, Men and brethren what shall we do? Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.” Here faith is not mentioned; though it may be considered as implied.† When Peter perceived, that Simon the sorcerer was in the gall of bitterness, he said to him, Repent of this thy wickedness, and pray God; if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee.‡ Here *repentance* and *prayer* only are mentioned. When Peter had healed the lame man at the gate of the temple, and charged the Jews who had assembled on the occasion, with having denied the Holy One, and killed the Prince of life; he said to them, *Repent* and be *converted*, that your sins may be blotted out.§

In several instances, particular *practical* duties are enjoined.—When John said to the multitude which came to be baptized of him, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? he added, Bring forth therefore, *fruits* worthy of repentance. And the people asked him, What shall we *do* then? He an-

* Ezek. iii. 17 & xxxiii. 7. † Acts ii. 37. ‡ Acts viii. 21. § Acts iii. 19.

swered, He that hath two coats let him impart to him that hath none. Then the *publicans* said to him, What shall *we* do? He said unto them, Exact no more than that which is appointed you. The *soldiers* likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall *we* do? He said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely.*

Sometimes obedience is required in more *general* terms. Let the wicked *forsake his way*, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him.† Cleanse your *hands* ye sinners, and purify your *hearts* ye double minded. Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up.‡ Put away the evil of your doings; Cease to do evil; learn to do well; Relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow. Ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and *walk* therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls.

When the rich young man came to Christ, saying, What good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? He said unto him, If thou wilt enter into life, *keep the commandments*.§ If it be supposed, that this answer was given merely to open his eyes to the sinfulness of his past life, we are to observe, that Jesus said also to him, Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven.

When a certain *lawyer* said to Christ, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? When he answered, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself. Jesus said to him, This do, and thou shalt live.

If I were called upon, to express in a summary manner, the spirit

and substance of these several directions, I should say to the sinner, “*In the exercise of FAITH and REPENTANCE, enter IMMEDIATELY upon a life of HOLY OBEDIENCE.* Do this, and you will be saved.” Immediate belief, immediate repentance, and immediate obedience are commanded. By holy obedience, I would be understood to mean, not only the affections of the heart, but the practical duties of life; not only internal feelings, but external actions.

But, it may be asked, should not the sinner first see to it, that his *heart* is right, that his *affections* and *purposes* are holy, before he enters upon the performance of *practical* duties? I answer, he is required immediately to *have* a new heart, immediately to *exercise* holy affections. But he is not told, in the scriptures, to wait till he *knows* or *believes* that his heart is changed, before he ventures upon any external duty. John does not say to those whom he calls a generation of vipers, First repent, then ascertain that you *have* repented, and *then* reform; but he tells them at once, to bring forth *fruits* meet for repentance. Our Lord does not say to the young man, First learn that you have a new heart, and *then* obey; but, if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments,—sell all that thou hast. He does, indeed, say to the Pharisees, Cleanse *first* that which is *within* the cup and the platter.* But what is the defilement which he represents as within? “Extortion and excess;” not mere abstract feelings, as distinguished from practical purposes and actions. And in what way, according to his directions, is the inward cleansing to be made? “Give alms of such things as ye have, and all things are clean unto you.”† The prophets say directly, Cleanse your *hands*, ye sinners; Cease to do evil; learn to

* Matt. iii. 8. Luke iii. 8—14. † Isa. lv. 7. ‡ James iv. 8. § Matt. xix. 16.

* Matt. xxiii. 26. Luke xi. 39. † Luke xi. 41.

do well ; Relieve the oppressed, &c. How is a man to know, that his heart, his *affections* are right, if they excite to no holy purposes ? And how can he know that his *purposes* are holy, if they all relate to the future, and have no reference to the *present* performance of duty ? He that *doeth* righteousness is righteous ; not he who merely *intends* to do his duty, at some future period.

Is the sinner to be called upon to do any thing *preparatory* to faith and repentance ? To *begin* to repent, no preparation is necessary, except that he know that he is a sinner. And to *begin* to believe, no preparation is necessary, except that he have the proper *object* of faith in view. This may fairly be supposed to be the case, in some degree at least, with every one in a Christian land, whose attention is excited to the concerns of the soul. But it is proper to call upon him to do that which is preparatory to *deeper* repentance, and *higher* degrees of faith : that is, to obtain more adequate views of his own guilt, and more exalted apprehensions of the grace of the Saviour. It is the duty of the Christian to be in the exercise of increasing repentance and faith, *during life* ; and therefore to be in the diligent use of the means calculated to bring the *objects* of these graces more fully before the mind. He can repent, only so far as he knows what he is to repent *of* ; and he can believe, only so far as he learns *what* he is to believe.

Is the sinner to be directed to do any thing *before* he repents and believes ? He is neither to *delay* repentance and faith till he has done something else ; nor is he to delay the performance of practical duties on the ground that he has not yet repented and believed. I would not be understood as intending to decide the question, whether, in the order of nature, certain exercises of the renewed mind must not

precede others ; whether conversion begins always with repentance, or faith, or love. If there is any invariable order in these exercises, they may succeed one another so *rapidly*, that the necessity of this order can furnish no excuse for any perceptible delay, with respect to either of them, or with respect to the commencement of practical godliness.

But how, it may be asked, is the including of Christian *practice* among the duties required of the sinner, consistent with the orthodox doctrine, that the *first* duty to be pressed upon every sinner, is immediate *repentance* ? “God commandeth *all* men—*now* to repent.” I answer, that according to the statement which I have made, immediate repentance *is* required.—But if repentance be understood in the limited sense, as consisting in sorrow for sin, this is not the *only* duty immediately required, as is manifest from the texts which have been quoted. It ought to be observed, however, that according to scriptural usage, the word repentance has commonly a much more *extensive* signification ; especially when the Greek is *μετανοια*. It *includes* Christian practice. It is turning from sin to holiness. It is reformation of heart and life. It is ceasing to do evil and learning to do well. In the scriptural sense, therefore, to call upon a man to repent, is to call upon him to enter immediately upon a life of holy obedience. When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness, and *doeth* that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive.*

It may be farther objected, that a man must first have *faith*, before you set him upon the performance of *external* duties. Without faith, it is impossible to please God.—But what is the *nature* of the faith which is spoken of in this passage ? It is undoubtedly saving faith : for

* Ezek. xviii. 27.

the apostle says the just shall *live* by faith; and adds, We are of them—that believe *to the saving of the soul*; and then immediately enters upon that description of faith which is continued through the 11th chapter of Hebrews; and which is by far the most particular account of this grace, any where to be found in the scriptures. And what is the representation here given of the faith without which it is impossible to please God? Is it described as a faith which is exercised solely or principally in *contemplation*, or acts of devotion; which is confined to abstract *feelings*, unconnected with conduct; which *precedes* all attempts at practical godliness? Is it not rather spoken of as chiefly expressed in the *life*; as *accompanying* external duties? By faith, Noah prepared an ark. By faith, Abraham *obeyed*, and sojourned in the land of promise. By faith, he offered up Isaac. As James expresses it, faith wrought *with* his works. By faith, Moses forsook Egypt. By faith, others subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, wandered in deserts and mountains, &c.

But by exhorting impenitent sinners to practical duties, shall we not be in danger of leading them to rely on mere external *moral*ity, as a *substitute* for inward piety? We shall, undoubtedly, if we *confine* our exhortations to external conduct; if we do not insist upon the necessity of love, and faith, and penitence, to render *any* action acceptable to God. But enjoining upon sinners the immediate performance of *every* duty, both internal and external, is not encouraging them to believe, that the latter class *alone* will entitle them to salvation.—They may *perv*ert the truth, in this case, as well as in others. Yet the proper way to guard against this perversion, is to exhibit the truth to them, not in any mutilated and distorted representations, but in the

full and fair proportions in which it is presented in the scriptures.

It may be said again, if the sinner should *not* mistake external morality for *real holiness*; yet he will be in danger of relying upon his works, as *recommending* him to the mercy of God, and *preparing* him to receive renewing grace. This is very possible, and I fear very common. Yet the proper way to counteract the destructive influence of error, is not to *conceal* the truth; but to bring it forward in such a manner, as to *correct* the error.

Again it may be asked, is it not expedient to chain down the attention of the awakened sinner to the single point of his guilt and danger? Is not this the way to give the deepest tone to his feelings; to bring his distress and convictions to a crisis? Is it not best to omit, for the present, any mention of external duties, lest this should *divert his attention* from the immediate and pressing demands of conscience? The most direct answer to this is, that so far as the plan of address here proposed varies from that which is presented to us in the scriptures, it is a scheme of *human* invention; and therefore we ought not to expect, that it will be more efficacious than that which has come to us from heaven. No mode of addressing the conscience, no process of conviction, will be of any avail, without the renewing influence of the Spirit. And which have we reason to believe he will most readily bless, the plan of instruction and exhortation pointed out in his word, or that which is substituted by the ingenuity of man? The Christian minister who is really in earnest, in seeking the salvation of his impenitent hearers, will not be satisfied with merely *stating* to them the terms, which, if complied with, will ensure their salvation. He must be unfaithful indeed, if he does *less* than this. But he is bound to do *more*; to give

such a scriptural exhibition of the truth, as is best calculated, in connexion with the influence of the Spirit, to *obtain* the compliance of his hearers.

Is it true, that external conduct is not included under the immediate demands of conscience? And will *he* have a juster sense of his guilt, whose mind is turned to a *part* only of the duties which he fails to perform, than he upon whom *every* violation and omission is distinctly pressed?

It may be very proper, for a preacher, on particular occasions, for the sake of exciting emotion, to confine himself to a single topic. The practice of the apostles was not inconsistent with this. They vary their mode of address, to adapt it to persons and circumstances. It may be proper to confine the attention of an awakened sinner, for days, perhaps, to one simple view of his case. But if this does not produce the desired effect, you will in vain hope to deepen his emotions, by repeating the same thoughts in nearly the same forms of expression, after the influence of novelty has ceased. If you would still reach his heart, you must change the nature, or the manner, of your address; without yielding, however, any one point, in the demands of the law or the gospel. The Christian preacher has no reason to complain, that he has not an ample field for the exercise of his powers, in dealing with sinners; that he has nothing to say to them, but simply "Repent and believe." He may spend a life, in explaining and enforcing even *these* duties; and that, without treading always in the same beaten track. He may dwell upon every sin which his hearers are required to forsake; upon every duty which they are bound to perform; upon every truth which they are commanded to believe.

One other objection may be

made to exhorting sinners to the immediate performance of practical duties; That it is exposing them to the danger of indulging a *false hope*; of resting upon *external morality*, as *evidence* of Christian character. To guard against this, it may be said, that they ought *first* to be satisfied that their *hearts* are right, by looking in upon the affections, without reference to practice. If we take the *scriptures* for our guide, however, we shall find that the danger lies *the other way*; in coming to a decision respecting our character, from the *affections alone*, before there is sufficient *opportunity* for the trial by practice. We ought to judge of our piety, not by *feelings alone*, nor by *external conduct alone*, but by *both together*. On this point, I have taken the liberty to quote largely from President Edwards's Treatise on the Affections. I place great reliance on his authority, as he not only has written this laboured and profound work, on the evidences of Christian character, but had great experience in powerful and extensive revivals of religion. The Treatise on the Affections was published ten or twelve years after the great revival in his own congregation at Northampton; and in the interval, the writer had the advantage of great experience of the results of that remarkable work of grace; and also, of a more general revival in 1740, extending over most parts of New-England. That which he so much insists upon, as being especially *scriptural* evidence of Christian character, and of vastly greater importance than every thing else, is Christian *practice*, consisting in external obedience, together with those holy purposes which he terms *imperative* acts of the mind, in distinction from the views and feelings which are principally experienced in contemplation. Having enumerated various traits of Christian character, as they appear in the

life, he adds, "Such a manifestation as has been described, of a Christian spirit in *practice*, is vastly beyond the fairest and brightest story of particular steps, and passages of experience, that was ever told."* "Christian practice, in the sense that has been explained, is the chief of all the evidences of a saving sincerity in religion, to the consciences of the professors of it; much to be preferred to the method of the first convictions, enlightenings, and comforts in conversion; or any immanent discoveries or exercises of grace whatsoever, that begin and end in contemplation."† "True grace is not an *inactive* thing. There is nothing in heaven or earth, of a more active nature. It is the very nature or notion of grace, that it is a principle of holy action or practice. *Regeneration* has a direct relation to practice. We are created unto good works."‡ Again, "holy practice is ten times more insisted on, as a note of true piety, throughout the scripture, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation, than any thing else. And in the New Testament, where Christ and his apostles do expressly, and of declared purpose, lay down the signs of true godliness, this is almost *wholly* insisted on."§ "Christ nowhere says, ye shall know the tree by its *leaves* or *flowers*, or ye shall know men by their talk, or ye shall know them by the good story they tell of their experiences;—but by their *fruits* shall ye know them."|| So men's practice is the *only* evidence, that Christ represents the future *judgment* as regulated by, in that most particular description of the day, Matthew xxv. The Judge will not go about to examine men, as to the method of their *experiences*, or set every man to tell his story of the manner of his conver-

sion; but his *works* will be brought forth as evidence of what he is."**

Once more, "I think it to be abundantly manifest, that Christian practice is the most proper evidence of the gracious sincerity of professors, to *themselves* and *others*; and the chief of all the works of grace, the sign of signs, the evidence of evidences, that which seals and crowns all other signs. I had rather have the testimony of my conscience, that I have such a saying of my supreme Judge on my side, as that John xiv. 21, He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; than the judgment and fullest approbation of all the wise, sound, and experienced divines, that have lived this thousand years, on the most exact and critical examination of my experiences, as to the manner of my conversion."†

If the views of Edwards on this subject are correct, is it not evident that the danger of deception is far greater, when self-examination is confined to the state of the affections, at the commencement of a religious course, than when the practical duties of life are taken into the account, in connection with the feelings of the heart? And have we not reason to believe, that many fail of finding *peace* in religion, by seeking it in the *affections* only, while they live in the neglect of outward acts of obedience. Can we be justified in leading any to suppose that a well grounded evidence of their own Christian character, can be obtained, while they are living in the omission of those practical duties, from which scriptural evidence is principally to be derived?

"It is greatly to the hurt of religion," says President Edwards, "for persons to make light of, and insist little on those things which the scripture insists most upon, as

* Works, vol. iv. 368—9. Same vol. p. 376. † p. 346. § p. 386. || p. 354.

* Vol. iv. 393. † p. 394.

of most importance in the evidence of our interest in Christ ;—depending on our ability to make nice distinctions in these matters, and a faculty of accurate discerning in them, from philosophy or experience. It is in vain to seek for any better or any further signs than those that the scriptures have most expressly mentioned, and most frequently insisted on, as signs of godliness. They who pretend to a greater accuracy in giving signs, are but subtil to darken their own minds and the minds of others ; their refinings and nice discernings are, in God's sight, but refined foolishness and a sagacious delusion.* “ Unless we suppose, that when Christ and his apostles, on design, set themselves about this business of giving signs, by which professing Christians in all ages might determine their state, they did not know how to choose signs, so well as we could have chosen for them.”† “ It is strange how hardly men are brought to be contented with the rules and directions which Christ has given them, but they must needs go by other rules of their own inventing, that seem to them wiser and better. I know of no directions or counsels which Christ ever delivered more plainly than the rules he has given us, to guide us in our judging of others' sincerity, viz. that we should judge of the tree chiefly by the fruit. But yet this will not do ; but other ways are found out, which are imagined to be more distinguishing and certain. And woful have been the mischievous consequences of this arrogant setting up men's wisdom above the wisdom of Christ.‡”

But if a *life* of godliness is the grand evidence of grace in the heart, are we to tell the sinner he must first ascertain that he is a Christian, before we can give him

any directions concerning practical duties ? that he must first learn that his heart is changed ; that he must show us his faith without his works ; and then we will put him in the way of deciding by the *scriptural* rule, what has been previously decided *without* this rule ? Is there no danger in thus hurrying him to settle this most momentous point, before he has even an *opportunity* of applying the test of character given in the Bible ? Is he to be called upon, not only to *repent* immediately, but immediately to *entertain a hope* that he is converted ? As on the one hand, the salvation of the soul is hazarded by a moment's delay of repentance ; may it not, on the other hand, be hazarded by *want* of delay, in coming to the conclusion, that heaven is already secured ? If we may not direct a man to the performance of practical duties till we are convinced that he is a Christian ; we must either judge of his state by other rules than those of scripture ; or we must wait till he has found his way to a godly life, *without* our directions. Are we not getting too much into the way of looking, for evidences of grace, principally to the *commencement* and the *close* of a religious life ; to the first comforts of the supposed convert, and the last broken expressions of his dying bed ?

In the application of the *promises* and the *threatenings* of the Bible, a wide difference is to be made between saints and sinners. “ Say ye to the righteous, it shall be *well* with him. Woe to the wicked, for it shall be *ill* with him.” But in prescribing *duties* to be performed, it is not always necessary that the preacher should know, whether those whom he addresses are pious or not. Immediate repentance, obedience, and faith, are to be enjoined upon both saints and sinners.

NATHAN.

* Vol. iv. 414. † p. 338. ‡ pp. 113, 114.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

A REVIEW of "Two Discourses on the Nature of Sin," which appeared in the *Churchman's Magazine* for November; and the communication of a correspondent in the number just issued; for January, who has remarked upon those Discourses; have, each, attracted my notice, and, perhaps, the notice of many of your readers. I have felt that the duty devolved upon me, peculiarly, as the author of those discourses, to examine the remarks of others made upon them; and to avail myself of every means which these might furnish for illustrating the real truth on the subjects of which they treat: for to no sect or teacher on earth am I so much bound as to my Master in Heaven, and the truth is that which, as his servant, it becomes me to seek for myself, and to inculcate upon others. Perhaps your readers will not take it amiss, if I present to them a few thoughts which have occurred to my own mind on reading the abovenamed articles.

A word only respecting the correspondent. Not alluding to the artificial terrors with which he playfully surrounds me as the official and uncontradictable dictator to my brethren, it is sufficient to examine the judgment which, he declares, has passed from my lips, and by which he diverts attention from a charge made against the Bishop of New-York: 'Your depravity is not your crime, but your misfortune.' He who derives, from discourses which were intended to resolve human depravity simply into the sinful acting of men, an inference so directly contrary to their purport, must, it would seem, have been either very inattentive to the discourses, or else much blinded by his own unthinking familiarity with the strange position. "Certainly, in the judgment of the learned professor, it

[man's depravity] is not morally or metaphysically, in the abstract or by consequence, his crime"!—Where has "the learned professor" passed this judgment? In what he says of the nature of sin? But that he resolves into acts of free agency. In what he says of total depravity? But that he resolves into a continued train of such acting. In what he says of the ground of certainty that each descendant of Adam will sustain this character of total depravity? But that, so far as he represents it not to be the crime of the individual, he distinguishes from his depravity itself to which it gives rise. Where then has the professor given such judgment?

I pass to the reviewer. He begins with remarks on the arguments used in the Discourses. To contend about the strength of an argument would be folly; but to relieve it from misapprehension is an act of justice to him who uses it and to the truth. In commenting on the two first proofs, the reviewer evidently proceeds upon an erroneous view of their nature. Had I reasoned from these proofs, viz. the operations of conscience, and the universal sentiments of men, in the manner in which he supposes me to have done; that is, that conscience is a sufficient and infallible guide to truth, and that the sentiments of men are the model after which God forms his own sentiments; I should, indeed, have been an extremely weak reasoner, and deserved far severer animadversions than those gentle ones bestowed upon me. For, why should I ask a revelation from God, if, on all matters of truth and duty, I already had a sufficient and infallible one within me? or, why should I receive a revelation when presented to me, if I could receive one from no being but such as had already looked to man for the formation of his sentiments?

The obscurity which he finds in

the discourses, (and for which he accuses me of taxing my readers with a labour and perplexity overbalancing the profit,) may be the reason why he has misapprehended the nature of these arguments. The two I have virtually resolved into one; and the manner in which I suppose they yield us a probable evidence respecting the moral government of God, I have stated explicitly under the first of the two. In the Elements of Euclid, in the Principia of Newton, and indeed in every species of reasoning it is sufficient for the completeness of the proof, to state explicitly each step of the process once. Would it affect the real force of the reasoning to state it over twice, or to repeat it thrice? A very condensed view of the argument was given by me once, and I thought it sufficient for those who were willing to weigh and carefully consider. No others, from the very nature of the subject, could I invite to enter with me upon the investigation.

The proposition was essentially this—that for which God blames and punishes men in his moral government over the world is, invariably, *conduct in distinction from that which is not conduct*. For sources of proof, I adverted to two facts: one, that conscience does always, invariably, and necessarily, under whatever external means of education and influence men are placed, confine her decisions to *conduct in distinction from that which is not conduct*, the other, that men in their intercourse with one another and in the execution of laws, do always and invariably, pass the sentence of ill desert on others for *conduct in distinction from that which is not conduct*. My sole object was to separate the voluntary action of moral agents from all involuntary states, or properties, or relations of such agents, and in this broad separation of conduct from other things, I thought myself, and still think myself justified, in stating the facts to

be uniform, unchanging, and unalterable, implanted in the very constitution of man. Nor had I a word to say here, (nor should I think it relevant had it been said) respecting the changes which it is possible should occur, or which have actually occurred, in classing the various species of conduct into the moral varieties of the approved and the disapproved, the right and the wrong. Let all the fluctuation which the reviewer has asserted may arise from the adoption of different religious opinions be conceded to him; yet what shall decisions which are conversant wholly with different species of conduct, make against the assertion, that these decisions always respect conduct? and conduct only?

Now these are the facts on which the two first arguments are founded; and they are applied to support the proposition, on this one principle that in these invariable and necessary convictions of mankind, convictions necessarily springing from their original constitution as moral agents—God has indicated (to a degree which to say the least is highly probable) that in his moral government over the world, He Himself confines the obligations of his subjects to their voluntary conduct. He would not so constitute a race of moral and accountable agents, as that by their very constitution they should be irresistibly led to the conviction of a fundamental error concerning his government. The argument is one of moral probability, it is true; yet to one who is disposed to believe, that God indicates his designs in his works, or that he will act in accordance with the constitution he originally gives to his subjects; it will appear to be an applicable argument and one that carries with it some weight and conclusiveness.

Whether the presentation of such arguments be “*entirely* creditable to my power of reasoning,” or not, must be left with others to say:

and the reviewer is one among others. Yet while put on so delicate a question, I would fain look around me to discern in what company I have placed myself by this mode of reasoning; and inquire, who there are, among contemporaries or predecessors, to give it the weight of their authority. I have reasoned from the constitution of the creature to the design of the Creator: from the fact that we are so constituted by the Creator as to be incapable of emotions of remorse, or a feeling of ill desert for any thing beside our own voluntary acts, that his moral government over us is founded upon such a principle. Am I alone in this reasoning? Among recent authors I find the acute reasoner, Dr. Brown, late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, my firm associate. He has certainly analyzed our moral emotions into susceptibilities with which we have been endowed by the Creator, and placed the very basis of the moral government of God on this part of our constitution, that is, our perceptions of obligation in regard to an agent acting. Even in the somewhat varying systems of Paley, Clarke, and Wollaston, who ground moral distinctions severally on utility, on fitness, and on truth, the fundamental position respects conduct, and the acquiescence of the human mind in some ultimate obligation. The most enlightened of heathen moralists, Cicero, asserts of the law of nature, "It requires no commentator to render it distinctly intelligible, nor is it different at Rome, at Athens, now, and in the ages before and after, but in all ages and in all nations, it is, and has been, and will be, one and everlasting—one as that God its great author and promulgator, who is the common sovereign of mankind, is one." The enlightened, and devout Doddridge, refers specifically to the operations of conscience and the execution of laws among men, as evincing that natural liberty, or

the power of choosing, is the foundation of divine government. That distinguished prelate and profound reasoner, Bishop Butler, in his *Analogy* and other works, has, most distinctly, reasoned in the manner I have done; and some of his remarks are so strikingly pertinent, that I cannot forbear quoting them to your readers. In his dissertation on the nature of virtue, after alleging many considerations which prove that we have a "moral approving and disapproving faculty," he goes on to observe that "the object of this faculty is actions," premising that will and design constitute the nature of actions as distinguished from events. "Acting, conduct, behaviour, abstracted from all regard to what is, in fact and event, the consequence of it is itself the natural object of the moral discernment as speculative truth and falsehood is of speculative reason." "We never in the moral way applaud or blame either ourselves or others for what we enjoy or what we suffer, or for having impressions made upon us which we consider as altogether out of our power; but only for what we do, or would have done had it been in our power, or for what we leave undone which we might have done." The conclusion to which he comes respecting the moral government of God is this: "now if human creatures are endued with such a moral nature as we have been explaining, or with a moral faculty, the natural object of which is actions, moral government must consist in rewarding and punishing them for so doing"—that is, following or neglecting the rule of action suggested by this moral faculty. In his *Analogy* likewise, he reasons in the same manner. "His having annexed to some actions an inseparable sense of good desert, and to others of ill, this surely amounts to declaring upon whom his punishments shall be inflicted, and his rewards be bestowed. For he must have given us this discern-

ment and sense of things, as a presentiment of what is to be hereafter; that is, by way of information beforehand what we are finally to expect in his world." But I find one of greater authority than all philosophers, moralists, theologians, and prelates, ancient or modern, who is associated with me in this reasoning—the apostle Paul. In his epistle to the Romans, ii. 15, he appeals to this very manifestation of the sentiments of men in their accusing and excusing, as showing the work of the law written in their hearts: evincing a sentiment of nature within them—a feeling implanted within their breasts by their Creator, which of itself indicates the nature of his moral government. Am I then alone as a reasoner? or have I placed myself in creditable society?

Were it courteous now to retort, might I not call upon the reviewer to inform me whether it be creditable in him to state in his first paragraph that the proposition which is asserted in the Discourses is one which "*the common sense of mankind will uphold* and the whole spirit of the gospel will defend?" What has common sense to do with proving its truth, unless he resolves common sense into those plain and uneradicable dictates of conscience of which the discourses speak? And how, after taking such a position, will he defend such a bald assertion, as he makes in the direct face of it, on the following leaf: "there may be a thousand reasons, for any thing we can know, why God should reckon as sinful in any being, many other things, than his own personal violations of law?" Is not this to declare with one breath that common sense and the spirit of the gospel will uphold a truth, and yet there may be a thousand reasons for aught we know that it should not be true? But I forbear: it is not my object to have recourse to uncourteous retorts; but barely

to set my meaning clearly before your readers.

The reviewer next rejoices to see me coming forth to the light of "a purer theology" "than that which has long prevailed among Congregationalists, and still continues, not only in that order of Christians, but also among our own divines." The reviewer pours forth this joy over my denial of the literal imputation of the sin of Adam. How far that tenet is held among Episcopal divines at this day, I pretend not to know; but that it is not held to any extent by the Congregationalists of this State, and that my public denial of that tenet is not emerging forth to any clearer light than that which has blessed my brethren, I do know.

There is but one subject more touched upon by the reviewer, of which I wish to say any thing. I allude to that which he calls "strange language for an intelligent divine, the pastor of an intelligent flock like that at Yale College;" and which he characterizes as conveying the doctrine of fatalism, viz.: the certainty of which I speak, that the descendants of Adam will be sinners. If he call this language strange with reference to Yale College, as being unprecedented there, he may take from his shelf the volumes of Dr. Dwight, and read his discourses on the decrees of God, and on the depravity of men, and gain a better information. If he call it strange for any man of intelligence to assert, then may he call those who framed the articles of his own church and all who have maintained those articles, destitute of intelligence. If he think it conveys a dangerous fatalism, which is destructive of free and responsible agency, his opinion is unwarranted by the language. His own language "irresistibly propels" "irresistible influence," "without the possibility of resistance," refers to a cause of sin which is irresistible in its nature, a cause

which with physical necessity produces its results. I have asserted no such thing. I maintain no such thing. I selected my language with the very intention of distinguishing moral causes from physical, and the certainty of free actions from a blind necessity. For, who that holds that moral agents are themselves the immediate authors, the immediate antecedents of their own actions, can allow other things to hold any other relevance to their actions as causes, than as grounds of certainty, or influential causes,—I mean other things within the range and system of created things?

In regard to the certainty of human conduct itself, have I asserted any thing more than even the reviewer himself will acknowledge to be true? He allows, I presume, that God at least foresees how men will conduct themselves: and the foreknowledge of their conduct involves its certainty. Or is the certainty of sinning which I have attributed to men, a certainty which he will not acknowledge to exist? But I have applied the certainty no further than I apprehend it to exist, from the facts which are exhibited to me in the history of the world and the infallible record of divine knowledge; not as a certainty which at all excludes the concomitant ability of obedience; which excludes the power of breaking off from iniquity by returning to God; or which excludes the certainty of "multitudes whom no man can number" actually returning to the Lord on earth, through the influences of his Spirit, and praising Him with the celestial hosts before his throne in heaven. In the bosom of the church catholic, before her altars of devotion, and out of the records of her faith, have I learned the truth that man is exceeding corrupt and "very far gone from original righteousness." I take it for an undoubted certainty,

that each descendant of Adam will partake in this character—the very certainty in view of which the Lord, the messenger of the covenant, has visited his temple, with the annunciation of recovering grace to the Jew and the Gentile; and with the threatening to the despisers of this grace of irrevocable plagues beyond this life. This certainty I have endeavoured to trace up to a cause, (so far as an influential cause might be found in the system of created things,) existing in the very constitution which as moral beings we inherit from our original and sinning ancestor. Whether this be among opinions which the reviewer would characterize as "old fashioned and profitless," or not, I see no reason for discarding it from the articles of my belief. Old fashioned it may be; for truth herself is old, the attendant on all time, the daughter of eternity, the eldest on her embassy from the throne of God. Profitless it cannot be if truth proclaims it: for on her embassy of light she is sent to vindicate the conduct of her God to the world, and invite the erring and the lost to a place in his family of love.

E. T. F.

ADDRESS AT THE GRAVE OF M. VINCENT DE ST. LAURENT.*

Address delivered on Saturday, May 7, 1825, in the Cemetery of l'Est, over the grave of M. Vincent de Saint Laurent, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Protestant Bible Society of Paris, in the name of the Committee of said Society, by J. J.

* M. Jacques Vincent Saint Laurent was born at Nismes in the department of Gard, January 9, 1758, and died at Paris, May 6, 1825. He was a member of the consistory of the reformed church of Paris, honorary member of the committee of its schools, member of the Royal Society of Agriculture, and correspondent of the Institute of France, and of the Royal Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres.

Goepp, Pastor of the Christian Church of the Augsburg Confession at Paris, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Bible Society. *Translated for the Christian Spectator, from the Thirty-seventh Bulletin of the Protestant Bible Society of Paris, May, 1825, by JACOB PORTER.*

“WHY, my brethren, at a ceremony like that which now calls us together in this solemn place, over the grave of so worthy a citizen as him whom we deplore, in the midst of so many more capable than myself, of honouring his memory,—why should it be that my feeble voice must be heard on so melancholy an occasion? Why did the committee of the Bible Society of Paris, in whose name I now address you, choose so feeble an organ to express its regret on occasion of the death of one of its most distinguished members, of one who was so dear to us all?

Alas! brethren, were there any one that is not painfully affected with every thing that a beloved church, with which we love to mingle our interests, deplores in the person of M. Vincent de Saint Laurent; any one, that is not feelingly alive to every thing that our society owes to this respectable man, to all the services that he has successively rendered it in quality of one of its founders, of one of its secretaries and vice-presidents; to every thing that it loses in finding itself henceforth deprived of his intelligence and his zealous concurrence; such an one doubtless would acquit himself no better than I. But how much soever I am touched with the merits of this worthy member of our pious association, and how little soever I may be able to avail myself of them at this time of mourning, happily those among us, who were witnesses, have preserved and will always preserve, as well as myself, the grateful remembrance; to others I will say that the exalted wis-

dom, the ardent love of virtue, and the enlightened piety, that they have seen him display in all the relations of life, and of which my respected brother, M. Juillerat Chasseur, has drawn a touching picture, these he has likewise displayed, in a most distinguishing manner, in the sacred work of disseminating our divine books.

Being perfectly acquainted with the spiritual wants of the Protestants in France, and bearing towards them a lively and tender affection, M. Vincent de Saint Laurent was among the first who desired the establishment, in the capital, of one of those societies by which the gospel of the Saviour of the world, with its heavenly light and cheering consolations, is spread, not only in the palaces of the rich, but above all in the cottages of those that bear the fatigue and heat of the day; among the first who laboured for it; and when his wishes were crowned with success, when the government, convinced of the utility of such a society, had authorized its formation, with what zeal did he assist in all its labours, in its progressive development, in its ever beneficial operations? During the six years of its existence, a great part of the time of our venerable colleague was consecrated to its benevolent concerns. The greater part of its duties, and those precisely that required constant labour, devolved on him, and found him invariably devoted in his indefatigable co-operation. When, above all, his health—become more and more feeble,—should have diverted him from its affairs, it was not possible for him to give himself that repose which his situation seemed to require,—that of being no more employed on an object, to which he attached the highest importance, so that, even to the time of his last sickness, which has brought us to this scene of mourning, we had the happiness

of seeing him seated in the midst of us, of profiting by his counsels and the wisdom of his directions. After the example of the Saviour, whose footsteps he loved to follow, "I must," said he, "do the works of him that sent me, while it is day; the night is coming when no one can work."

Alas! brethren, it is come, that night, which has brought to a close the terrestrial activity of our beloved friend, it is come, too soon for his family and his friends, too soon for us, his colleagues in the Biblical work, too soon for all those who had opportunity to appreciate his noble character, his elevated sentiments, his constantly liberal efforts. An excellent life was extinct; a mind rich in rare and most precious qualities, a mind endowed with eminent faculties left this world when our brother closed his dying eyes to the light of day. We cannot but be penetrated with the keenest sorrow at such a death. In our deliberations, over which his upright spirit, his various knowledge, his powerful eloquence, ex-

ercised so happy an influence, his absence will be deeply felt, as well as in his church, in the circle of his friends, and in the bosom of his family.

But, brethren, in regretting the good, that has escaped us, having the delightful persuasion that qualities such as we have admired in our dear brother, cannot become the prey of the sepulchre; that, in a new and better world his noble faculties will be unfolded in a nobler manner, and take a more brilliant and rapid flight, we moderate our grief; we accompany with our blessings, before the throne of Jehovah, the righteous man, from whom death has separated us for a moment, we preserve the remembrance of him, we preserve it as a precious heritage, that he bequeathed us on quitting this earthly scene, and by which we may still profit; and over his grave we form the resolution to follow his excellent example, to imitate his ardent zeal, by doing good without weariness, so that, in due time, if we do not grow remiss, we may reap the fruit."

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

SPECIMENS OF CHINESE LITERATURE.

In looking over, a few years since, some Numbers of the "Indo-Chinese Gleaner," published by the missionaries at Malacca, some translations from the most celebrated Specimens of Chinese Literature, struck my mind so forcibly that I was induced to make a few extracts. Within a few days, these extracts, after having slumbered among a mass of old papers, have met my eye once more. It occurred to me that they might make a "page for the idler" in the Christian Spectator.

Professor Norton says of Mrs. Hemans, that she is "eminently a female writer." I trust therefore it will seem neither solecistical nor unintelligible for me to say of these extracts that they are *eminently Chinese*. There is about them, generally, the same incongruity and bad taste which we see in the pictures on Chinese porcelain. Some sentences are at once instructive and truly beautiful. Others, designed to be equally beautiful and equally instructive, only divert us by their oddity.

In a few instances the coincidence in thought and illustration

with some passages of the Bible is worthy of notice.

FROM "MING SIN PAOU KEEN,"
(Indo Chinese Gleaner, Aug. 1818.)

"Sit in your secret chamber, as if passing through the public street; take care of the inch-large heart, as if driving six horses." Compare Prov. iv. 23. "Keep thy heart with all diligence."

"Man's temper is like water. Water overturned cannot be gathered up again. The temper let loose cannot be brought again under restraint." Prov. xvii. 14. "The beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water."

"The living man who does not learn is dark, dark, like one walking in the night." Ecclesiastes ii. 13, 14. "Then I saw that wisdom excelleth folly, as far as light excelleth darkness. The wise man's eyes are in his head, but the fool walketh in darkness."

"The mouth is the door of human misery; and the tongue, the axe which exterminates the body." James, iii. 6. "The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity: so is the tongue among the members that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature; and it is set on fire of hell."

"There are four things in women which deserve praise: a woman's virtue, her countenance, her words, her labours. A woman's virtue requires no extraordinary talent, above that possessed by others. Her countenance requires not the exquisite charms of superlative beauty. Her words require not fluent lips, or the talent of discussion. Her labours require not a higher degree of skill and dexterity, than that commonly possessed by others. Let her be chaste, innocent, sober, and economical; mind

her duty; be neat; in walking and resting, preserve modesty; in all her actions, observe a rule;—these constitute female virtue. Let her wash and dust well, keep her clothes neat and clean; bathe at proper times; and preserve her person cleanly; these constitute female beauty. Let her choose her words; avoid unbecoming conversation; speak at proper times; thus she will not displease others;—these constitute female conversation. Let her diligently spin and make cloth; let her not indulge her appetite, in regard to savory food and liquors; let her prepare good things to set before the guests;—these constitute female labour. These four combine the essential virtues and duties of women. They are exceedingly easy, and she who practices them is a virtuous woman."

The writer in the Gleaner remarks, "this sentiment of disrespect to the female character pervades the Chinese books, manners and hearts." More of it will be seen in the extracts which are to follow.

"Brothers are like hands and feet. A wife is like one's clothes. When clothes are worn out, we can substitute those that are new. When hands and feet are cut off, it is difficult to obtain substitutes for them."

FROM THE "SHOO-KING."

"The fish dwell in the bottom of the waters, and the eagles in the sides of heaven—the one though high, may be reached by the arrow; and the other though deep, may be angled—but the heart of man, at only a cubit's distance, cannot be known: heaven can be spanned, earth can be fathomed—but the heart of man cannot be measured—Prov. xxv. 3. "The heaven for height, and the earth for depth, and the heart of Kings is unsearchable."

The following description of "the Paradise of Fuh," from some work the title of which I have not retained, is found in the *Gleaner* for Oct. 1818. The uncommon magnificence and splendor of some of the images, and the frequent use of the number *seven*, remind us of some passages in the *Apocalypse*. This difference however is striking: The material images made use of in the Bible are seen to be only the dim representation, the imperfect embodying of "things unutterable"—vast and glorious spiritual conceptions. But in the Chinese description these material images—the gold, and gems, and pearl—the palaces, and groves, and streams—are evidently the substance, not the shadow, and when these are given the picture is complete.

"The land of this kingdom is yellow gold. Its gardens, groves, houses, and palaces, are all elegantly adorned with seven orders of gems. It is encircled with seven rows of trees, seven borders of elegant network, and seven fences of palisades. In the midst there are the seven turrets and towers of gems, the seven flights of pearl stairs, the seven bridges of pearl, the seven pools of pearl, the eight kinds of virtue-producing water, and the nine classes of the lotus. There are also lovely doves, peacocks, parrots, birds, of sparkling plumage, and of exquisite notes. The great and unmeasured god O-LO-HAN, the famous disciples of Fuh, the relatives of the demi-gods, the goddess KWAN-YIN, the most powerful deliverer, the most pure gods of the vast ocean, the unnumbered renovating Fuhs, the unnumbered deliverers, all the demi-gods of past, present, and future ages, and all the sages, whether produced in heaven or among men,—all will be assembled on the sacred spot. But in that kingdom there are no women: the women who will live in that country are first changed into men. The inhabitants

have the lotus for their father and mother, from whom their persons are produced. [There are three general classes, each of which is subdivided into three.] There are born of the superior, middle, and lower orders of the first class; of the superior, middle, and lower orders of the second class; and of the superior, middle, and lower orders of the third class; these differences among the multitude of animated beings are the consequences of the various degrees of depth or shallowness, diligence and sluggishness, in the active energies. The bodies of the persons produced by the lotus, are pure and fragrant; their countenances, fair and well formed; their hearts full of wisdom and without vexation. They dress not, and yet are not cold; they dress and yet are not made hot. They eat not, and yet are not hungry; they eat, and yet are not filled. They are without pain, without itching, without sickness, and they become not old. Enjoying themselves at ease, they follow Fuh, gaily frisk about, and are without trouble. After every meal, they walk about with demi-gods, as their companions, on the stairs and walks of that palace. Their noses inhale the most delightful fragrance; their ears are filled with the most harmonious music; the birds of Paradise singing all around. They behold the lotus flowers, and trees of gems delightfully waving, like the motion of a vast sheet of embroidered silk. On looking upwards, they see the firmament full of the To-lo flowers, falling in beautiful confusion like the rain. The felicity of that kingdom may be justly called superlative; and the age of its inhabitants is without measure. This is the place called the Paradise (or joyful world) of the West. Alas! the riches and honours of men, after an hundred years, all revert to emptiness. The elegance and glory of heaven itself after a thousand years will cease."

How different from the Paradise of God—the heaven to which the Christian aspires, and where his hopes have built their home. They have no need of the sun by day or of the moon by night; for God is their EVERLASTING LIGHT, and the Lord their glory. The Christian can say, under the overwhelming flood of earthly disappointment, “We faint not,”—for our light affliction which is but for a moment worketh for us a far more exceeding and ETERNAL weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are ETERNAL. “We faint not,”—for we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, ETERNAL in the heavens. But when calamity and bereavement beset the disciple of Fuh, his only consolation is, Alas! the elegance and glory of heaven itself, after a thousand years will cease.

The reader may be gratified with one more extract, which shows us what is the Chinese idea of a paradise on earth. The national pride of the Chinese is well known. Their country is the celestial empire. It is the centre of the universe. All other nations are hordes of miserable wretches whose highest blessedness is, by trading with the happy inhabitants of their celestial empire, to obtain a few of their superabundant good things. The following piece of self-gratulation, is taken from the *Gleaner* for Oct. 1818. It is from the lips of Teen-ke-shih.

“I felicitate myself that I was born in China. I constantly think, what if I had been born beyond the seas, in some remote part of the earth, where the cold freezes, or the heat scorches; where the people are clothed with the leaves of plants, eat wood, dwell in the wilderness, lie in holes of the earth;

are far removed from the converting maxims of the ancient kings, and are ignorant of the domestic relations. Though born into this world, I should not have been different from a beast.

“But now, happily, I have been born in China! I have a house to live in; have drink, and food, and elegant furniture. I have clothing, and caps, and infinite blessings. Truly the highest felicity is mine.”

Such is national prejudice. The Frenchman surrounded by *gendarmes*, and trembling with the fear of the police, thinks that every other country is frightful compared with his beautiful France, his glorious France. The Englishman enveloped in everlasting fogs, and blackened with the smoke of sea-coal, thinks that every country but old England is the abode of wretchedness and starvation. The Georgian in his pine forest or on his sultry plantation, shuddering at every thought of negro insurrection, glories in the “moral strength” which exalts him above the plodding, scheming yankees. The citizen of the west, riding through woods and swamps to visit his next neighbour, is proud that he has elbow room, and thinks it would be imprisonment to live in the “old settlements.” The New-Englander looks round on his bleak hills, and calls the rough landscape “the glory of all lands.” And the “China man” exults that *he*, of all the world, has a house to live in; has drink, and food, and elegant furniture; has clothing, and caps, and infinite blessings. DRON.

LINES

Suggested by attending worship (for the first time after crossing the Atlantic) at the Chapel of the Rev. Lewis Way, on the CHAMPS ELYSEES, Paris.

THAT sacred dome, which meekly smiles,
O'er scenes where Pleasure revels wide:
And calls from Earth's seducing wiles,
The souls where Faith and Hope reside;—

That sacred dome was open thrown,
Wide as its owner's heart, once more;
And round the hallowed precincts shone,
The radiance of a brighter shore.

There, while from loftier structures rose,
The pomp of Power and pride of Art,
That modest temple only knows,
The breathing incense of the heart.

And there to join the happy few,
A stranger came; who long did mourn,
Far on the Atlantic wave, anew,
Each lonely Sabbath's slow return.

Long had he felt the withering power
Of stern disease—the keener smart,
That waits the solitary hour—
The desolation of the heart.

Then Oh! what joy was his to kneel
Once more, amid the adoring throng;
And hear the anthem's solemn peal,
Sound sweetly in his native tongue;

To weep for sin where others weep;
To pour his prayer while others prayed,
Again, with gratitude too deep
For utterance, view THE BROKEN BREAD.

No face he knew—no eye was turned,
No hand of greeting stretched to him;

And yet his inmost bosom burned,
With all a brother's love for them.

And though no more on earth we meet,
No more our prayers in concert rise,
We still shall hold communion sweet,
The high communion of the skies.

And blest be he whose care gives birth,
To joys like these in souls prepared;
Who made these halls of giddy mirth,
The Temple of his dying Lord.*

And, where the wanton dance had been,
And Pleasure spread her fairy ground;
Has made the consecrated scene,
A spot where Angels linger round.

Blest be his care, and o'er his path
Be thrown the approving smile of Heaven!

How mean the pride and pomp of Earth,
To SOULS RENEWED, AND SINS FORGIVEN!

* The building converted into a place of worship by Mr. Way, was formerly a saloon for dancing, attached to the estate which he purchased on the *Champs Elysees*.

THEOLOGICAL COLLECTIONS.

EXTRACT FROM MUENSCHER'S MANUAL OF DOGMATIC HISTORY.

(Translated for the Christian Spectator.)

THAT part of Ecclesiastical History which relates to the doctrines which were held or taught in different ages of the church, the translator has ventured to denominate *Dogmatic History*, in imitation of the German phrase *Dogmengeschichte*. Among the most learned and candid writers on this subject, was the late Doctor William Muenschcr, Professor of Theology at Marburg in Germany. His *Handbuch der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, in four volumes 8vo. was first published about twenty years ago, and embraces the history of the six first cen-

turies. The extract here given, is taken from the Introduction, which is divided into six parts, and fills about one hundred pages. The first part prescribes the boundaries and the laws of dogmatic history; the second treats of the causes which have produced changes in the doctrinal views of Christians; the third is what is here translated, and relates to the utility of dogmatic history. The remaining parts relate to the sources, the literature, and the form of this species of history.

“In this age, when so many limit their studies as much as possible, and regard every thing as superfluous, that is not immediately necessary in their calling,—a disposition

which is very common among young theologians, but not to be commended,—the question perhaps may be asked, What is the use of dogmatic history? Is it not enough, that we understand the doctrines received by our church as sound and salutary? Why then waste time and labour to acquire knowledge of opinions long forgotten or exploded? As such questions are likely to be asked, and indeed, often are asked, it will not be unsuitable to state some of the advantages to be derived from the study of dogmatic history.

I. To trace the efforts which the human mind has made for enlarging, correcting, and confirming its knowledge, must undoubtedly be an interesting and instructive employment. The mind of man is ever reaching forward, searching after new truths, rejecting once received opinions, and striving to obtain more consistent and more perfect views; but it often meets insurmountable obstacles, is thrown back by adverse circumstances, and perhaps falls into error at the very time it supposes itself to be grasping truth. Proofs in point are afforded by the history of human knowledge in general, but especially by the history of Christian doctrines. This exhibits, in the most important of all concerns, both the direct and the retrograde movements of the human mind. It shows how at one time, blinded by ignorance and misguided by superstition, it has mistaken alike the design and the importance of religion; and at another, has thrown off the fetters of superstition and advanced directly towards a purer religious knowledge and worship. Can a reflecting man feel no interest in learning how Christians, for whom Jesus has marked out the path of true religion, have walked in it, often falling into devious paths, and then fetching a compass, again coming nearer to their mark? No one that takes an interest in the

progress of human improvement, can look with indifference on the changes which Christianity has undergone,—on the contests between light and darkness, in which they have alternately triumphed,—in short, on dogmatic history, which acquaints him with the advance and declension of religious knowledge among that large and most respectable portion of mankind who have professed Christianity.

II. But dogmatic history is especially important to Christians themselves, and doubly so to theologians. Whoever professes himself a Christian, and much more if he aspires to be an intelligent teacher of this religion, can scarcely avoid such questions as the following: Whence came the religion which I profess, or which I preach? Was it, from the first, what it now is; or by what series of changes was it brought into its present state and form? What has been its fate among men; and how has human ingenuity improved or perverted it? To answer these questions is the province of dogmatic history; for this, it is, shows us how the doctrines of Jesus were held from the beginning onward, how they were variously modified, loaded with pernicious additions, or purged from them; it enables us to see what the Christian religion originally was, and what it afterwards became, as well as the manner and the means of effecting the change. Now should not a teacher of this religion blush to be ignorant of all this?

And as it is expected, and very justly too, that every preacher should have a learned and systematic acquaintance with the religion which he presumes to teach, a knowledge of dogmatic history is especially important, as subservient to forming right conceptions and right judgments of our systematic theology. For our system of theology was perfected gradually, each period shaping it so as to meet the necessities of the age; and

many of its positions were framed merely to oppose certain existing errors, or to prevent some prevailing abuses. How then is it possible for us to understand the system of theology and all its several positions, without knowing the occasions and the causes of forming the individual parts, and the many alterations and changes by which the system finally became what it is? It is not in our power, for example, to comprehend perfectly the doctrinal views of the reformers, without comparing them with the tenets of those from whom they separated, and with the dogmas of the scholastics whom they opposed. Thus dogmatic history shows us how and wherefore the several articles came to occupy their respective places in our creed; and in this way, it leads us to view them in a proper attitude. Nor is this all; it teaches us to appreciate correctly the merits of the ancient, as well as of the modern theologians. It is a common fault of this age, to undervalue the ancient writers, and to express astonishment at their supposed weakness and blunders.—For instance, many a man now ridicules the subtilty of the scholastic doctors, who, had he lived in their age would scarcely have been employed by them as a transcriber. From such rash decisions dogmatic history is a preservative. It shows us just how far the ancient theologians proceeded, and why they, from the circumstances of the times and various impediments, could not effect what our age, mounted on the shoulders of preceding ages, is able to accomplish. The materials were first to be collected and severally wrought, then out of them system after system must be built up and pulled down, till finally the proper pieces were duly united in a firm and abiding system. Dogmatic history does justice to the old theologians, by showing that much of what is advanced in modern times as new, is not new. At

the same time it makes the superiority of modern dogmatics to be clearly seen. It shows incontestibly, how much the moderns excel the ancients in clearness of definition, and strength of reasoning, in a juster separation of the important from the unimportant, and of the certain from the problematical, as well as in lucidness of method, and in the practical bearing of their discussions. Thus while dogmatic history enables us to compare more accurately and impartially the ancient divines with the modern, it teaches us to appreciate the superiority of the latter, without doing injustice to the former.

III. Important as this use of dogmatic history is, it is surpassed by another. For, by means of this history, we are able, more easily, to separate genuine Christianity from its spurious appendages. By the professed followers of Jesus, his doctrines have been variously obscured, disfigured, and adulterated with foreign mixtures. The reformation in the sixteenth century by the protestants purged away indeed, many of the corruptions introduced by ignorance and superstition, and sanctified by spiritual despotism; and yet I dare to affirm, that since this beneficial reformation in theology, much still remains that needs amendment. Now the way to prosecute successfully further reformation, is pointed out by dogmatic history. For this discovers to us the sources and origin of many innovations in theology, and the means by which they obtained currency; and thus it enables us to judge better what to hold fast as belonging to genuine Christianity, and what to reject as useless and prejudicial.

Yet, not to overrate the value of dogmatic history, I must say, that historical investigation is rather a preparation for distinguishing between the doctrines of Jesus and foreign principles, than the full accomplishment of the object.—

Against the Catholic church indeed, it is of peculiar service ; for a church which boasts of the harmony of its opinions with all Christian antiquity, which asserts that it has preserved unchanged through all ages the primitive Christian faith, can be confuted in no better way, than by showing from history that precisely the distinguishing doctrines of this church were unknown to the early Christians, and that they were first invented and became current in times of ignorance and superstition. The reformers therefore, and the polemic writers generally, could justly employ such reasoning against the Catholics. Yet dogmatic history cannot alone prove decisively that any doctrine is, or is not, a part of genuine Christianity. For, if you regard a doctrine as belonging to Christianity because it was embraced and taught by the Christians of the first centuries, you must forget that the first Christians who received their instruction from Jesus Christ and his apostles, were converts from either Judaism or paganism, and that they retained many of their former conceptions, which became blended with their new faith, and which were afterwards propagated in the Christian church as parts of its faith ; in short, you must hold to a traditional creed, the entire purity of which it will be difficult to make out. On the other hand, I cannot maintain that a doctrine is always forthwith to be expunged from the list of Christ's doctrines, if it should appear that it was not known or not embraced in the first centuries after Christ. For the writers of the first centuries, whose works have reached us, do not merit the praise of being competent and happy expositors ; and it is therefore not impossible, nor indeed improbable, that some declarations of Christ and his apostles were misapprehended, perhaps for centuries, till at length their true import was discovered in a

subsequent age. But, granting all this to be true, if we cannot regard dogmatic history as the infallible touchstone of what is and what is not genuine Christianity, still it is a valuable help to come at this object. For if any particular doctrine can be shown to have first made its appearance in later times, if the suspicious source from which it flowed can be pointed out, and also the cause which gave it currency as a Christian doctrine, there is good ground to suspect that it was originally no part of the religion of Christ. I grant that this amounts only to a suspicion. For a doctrine of real Christianity may have been long buried in obscurity, and at length have come to light ;—it may have been brought forward too in a very unsatisfactory manner, and have been maintained by very unlawful means ; and after all, upon an impartial examination, be found to be true and useful. How often does a person or an age, by mere chance, stumble upon a discovery, which could not have been expected ! Still, such a suspicion should admonish us to be cautious, to go into a more full examination, and it can be set at rest only by exegetical and critical investigations.

IV. But were all the advantages now mentioned of less importance than they truly are, yet dogmatic history would be valuable, because it is suited to bring a theologian into precisely that state of mind which he most needs, in order to success in his vocation. From what source has theology hitherto received greater injury than from the bigotry and enthusiasm which have caused men to engage in controversy with unbending obstinacy, and to attack or defend an opinion with the fury of a warrior determined to conquer or die in the battle ? This has ever been followed by the never-failing consequence, that the contested points were discussed on one side only, and all opposing arguments were disregarded. The

calm and unbiased state of mind so necessary to the careful weighing of arguments and objections, and which alone can secure a man from precipitate and rash judgment, is wholly lost. Now the best preservative against this bigotry and blind zeal, is the study of dogmatic history. Whoever has there traced the revolutions in opinion, which were often as sudden as those in the fashion of garments,—whoever has there learned, that what one age held for incontrovertible truth, a following age rejected as error, will begin modestly to distrust the judgments of men, and of course his own also. He will not suffer himself, without examination, to be borne along the current of an age whose faith is bigotry. The authority of venerated names will not fetter him, for he has learned from history how little value to attach even to the decrees of vast synods of bishops. Nor will the brilliancy of novelty dazzle him; for he has often noticed, that what was brought forward as new, was not so; and that what pleased all, while new, soon became discarded.

A recent occurrence in the theological world may confirm these observations. When the great philosopher of Königsberg subjected to a more rigorous criticism the prevailing systems of philosophy, and began to lay the foundation for a new one, as soon as application was made of his principles to theology, that enthusiasm of which I have spoken, was strikingly manifest. Some, transported with admiration at the critical philosophy and its founder, could discover Kantian ideas all through the New Testament; and they looked upon no public discourses as solid and sound, unless the new terminology glittered along its periods; and whoever doubted any principle of the new philosophy, was regarded with contempt, as if he lacked common sense. Others were equally zealous against this philosophy,

which they found to be dangerous to religion, and leading evidently to scepticism, or to some worse evil. Now a person conversant with history will see nothing strange in these occurrences. For he well knows that men have ever mingled philosophy with religion; and that every attempt at a new combination produced at first a great ferment. He also knows, that as well the patrons of the new systems, as the adherents of the old ones, have always gone to extremes, in the beginning of their conflict; but when the heat of the battle subsided a little, both parties began slowly to come nearer to each other. And in the present instance, as an impartial looker on, he will cherish the single wish, that theologians would be grateful for the important hints and illustrations which Kant has given them; but without allowing their respect for a great man to shackle their minds and make them blind copyists, without marring their interpretations by philosophical subtleties, and without burdening their public discourses with unintelligible words; for the history of the Wolfian philosophy proves that such things will not meet the applause, but the censure of succeeding ages. I would therefore recommend dogmatic history to the young theologian, for the purpose of guarding him against a bigoted zeal for any opinions or sects, and of making him capable of enlightened and just views in theology. For it will be one of the best preservatives against that shortsighted bigotry which infallibly attends a theorizing divine, who, ignorant of what has been said and done by others, thinks he can accomplish every thing merely by his own sagacity, or—what is still worse—by following out the system of his master.

With the last mentioned advantage of dogmatic history, the following is closely connected, namely, that it reproves a contentious

spirit, and disposes us to be tolerant towards those who differ from us. Whoever has carefully studied the ever varying conceptions of men, and their causes, is sensible how much men's judgments and opinions depend on particular circumstances, and on the attitude in which objects are presented to their minds. It will be clear to him, from abundant experience, that it is next to impossible that men differing in talents, degrees of education, and rank in society, should have precisely the same views; and that it is unreasonable to require of others, that they should see with our eyes, and exchange their own modes of thinking for ours. Thus dogmatic history leads to amicable feelings and a discreet forbearance towards others, even though their opinions, according to our conceptions, are very ill founded. The examples it affords, of the melancholy effects resulting from a dominion over men's faith, and from attempts to dictate to men what they must believe, inculcate more forcibly than any precepts can, the apostolic exhortation, ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ, *to hold the truth in love*.

Without fear that he will be disappointed, therefore, we can assure the young theologian, that the study of dogmatic history will well reward his toil; and that it will enable him to come much nearer to his object, if he wishes to obtain not a superficial, but a thorough knowledge of his profession.

For the Christian Spectator.

MINISTERIAL PARITY.

It is worthy of note that the earlier Episcopal divines, in their strenuous reasonings against the pope's supremacy, frequently take ground which is equally conclusive against lower degrees of prelacy. Take for example the following passages from Barrow;—

others which have a similar bearing might be added from the same author.

S. R.

“As to a primacy, importing superiority in power, command, or jurisdiction; this by the *Roman* party is asserted to St. Peter, but we have great reason to deny it, upon the following considerations.

For such a power (being of so great importance) it was needful that a commission from God, its Founder, should be granted in downright and perspicuous terms; that no man concerned in duty grounded thereon, might have any doubt of it, or excuse for boggling at it; it was necessary not only for the apostles, to bind and warrant their obedience, but also for us, because it is made the sole foundation of a like duty incumbent on us, which we cannot heartily discharge without being assured of our obligation thereto, by clear revelation, or promulgation of God's will in the Holy Scripture; for it was of old a current, and ever will be a true rule, which St. Austin in one case thus expresseth, “I do believe that also on this side there would be most clear authority of the divine oracles, if a man could not be ignorant of it without damage of his salvation;” and Lactantius thus, “Those things can have no foundation or firmness, which are not sustained by any oracle of God's word.”

But apparently no such commission is extant in scripture; the allegations for it being as we shall hereafter show, nowise clear, nor probably expressive of any such authority granted by God;

* * * * *

Our Lord himself at several times, declared against this kind of primacy, instituting equality among his apostles, prohibiting them to affect, to seek, to assume, or admit a superiority of power, one above another.

There was (saith St. Luke, among the twelve, at the participation of the holy supper) "a strife among them who of them should be accounted the greatest," or who had the best pretence to superiority; this strife our Lord presently did check and quash; but how? not by telling them, that he already had decided the case in appointing them a superior, but rather by assuring them, that he did intend none such to be; that he would have no monarchy, no exercise of any dominion or authority by one among them over the rest; but that notwithstanding any advantages one might have before the other, (as greater in gifts, or as preceding in any respect,) they should be one as another, all humbly condescending to one another, each being ready to yield help and service to one another; "The Kings" said he, "of the Gentiles exercise Lordship over them; and they that exercise authority over them, are called benefactors, but ye shall not be so; but he that is greater among you let him be as the younger; and he that is leader, as he that doth minister;" that is, whatever privilege any of you obtaineth, let it not be employed in way of command, but rather of compliance and subserviency, as occasion shall require; let him not pretend to be a superior, but rather behave himself as an inferior; thus our Lord did smother the debate, by removing from among them, whatever greatness any of them did affect or pretend to; forbidding that any of them should, *κυριεύειν*, or *ἐξεζιχάζειν*, exercise any dominion or authority over the rest, as worldly princes did over their subjects.

* * * * *

It was indeed (as our Lord intimateth) incongruous for those, who had forsaken all things for Christ, who had embraced a condition of disgrace, who were designed by self denial, humility, neglect of

VOL. I.—No. I.

temporal grandeur, wealth, and honour, by undergoing persecution, and undertaking conformity to our Lord (being baptized with the baptism, with which he was baptized) to propagate the faith of a crucified Master; to seek, or take on them authoritative dignity; for among them there could not well be any need of commanding or being commanded; it was more fit, that all of them should conspire to help and serve one another, in promoting the common design and service of their Lord, with mutual condescension and compliance; which was the best way of recommending themselves to his acceptance, and obtaining from him an answerable reward. Such was the drift of our Lord's discourse; whereunto (as in the other case) he did annex the prohibition of exercising dominion: "Ye know," saith he, "that the Princes of nations exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them, but it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be first among you, let him be your servant;" *Ὁς ἐάν θέλῃ*, whoever among you hath a mind to special grandeur and pre-eminence, let him understand that there is none other to be attained, beside that which resulteth from the humble performance of charitable offices to his brethren; the which whoever shall best discharge, he alone will become greatest and highest in the eye of God.

* * * * *

Again, as to the power, which is now ascribed to St. Peter by the party of his pretended successors, we may argue from another place; where our Saviour prohibiting his disciples to resemble the Jewish scribes and pharisees in their ambitious desires and practices, their affectations of pre-eminence, their assuming places and titles importing difference of rank and authority,

hesaith, "But beye not called Rabbi, for there is one Master" (one guide or governor) "of you, even Christ, but ye are brethren." How more pregnantly could he have declared the nature of his constitution, and the relation of Christians one to another established therein, to exclude such differences of power? whereby one doth in way of domination impose his opinion or his will on others.

Ye are all fellow-scholars, fel-

low servants, and fellow-children of God; it therefore doth not become you to be any wise imperious over one another; but all of you humbly and lovingly to conspire in learning and observing the precepts of your common Lord; the doing which is backed with a promise and a threat suitable to the purpose; "He that exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that will abase himself shall be exalted;"

REVIEWS.

Elements of Biblical Theology, translated from the work of Storr and Flatt, with Additions; by S. S. SCHMUCKER. 2 vols. 8vo.—Andover: 1826.

GERMAN theologians and philologists we have never idolized; we have never thought that they were the only men, and that wisdom would die with them. We have known, and been ready ever to state, that whatever might be true or false as to the talents and erudition, and facilities for research, and fundamental methods of study, which have distinguished the Biblical scholars of Germany, the great body of them have come to results which make the Word of God a dead and useless book, while many of them have interpreted its most interesting passages in a manner a hundredfold more inconsistent with common sense than any of the mysticisms of the Platonists, or the absurdities of the schoolmen.

On the other hand, we have never been filled with alarm, as we know some excellent Christians have been, to notice a growing fondness among our theological students for German authors. We apprehend no important dangers from the greatest familiarity with

their philological and theological writings. Such a melancholy departure from truth and godliness as has been exhibited in the history of the Lutheran church of Germany, is not to be feared in the orthodox church of the United States. A grand reason is, that a very plausible heresy already exists in the country, under the banners of which all classes of unbelievers can most easily and most honourably rank themselves. That this heresy will extend farther than it has we think not improbable, when we consider how fond the depraved heart is of error in religion. But it will be extended, as it has been hitherto, chiefly by its gathering under the mantle of a very broad and indefinite name, all who dislike and reject the truth, and who are hereby induced to break away from the doctrines and discipline of a pure and holy church. The effect of this will be, not in reality to diminish the true church, but only to exalt its character, to raise its standard of piety, and increase its living energies. In this view we think the orthodox church has before her the brightest and most cheering prospects. Her lifeless members, her fruitless branches, are cut off; and of the support of

her life and strength, she has assurance, under God's blessing, from those peculiar means of grace, which the piety of the past and present generation has brought into use in this country. The great movements of benevolence which give a character to the age are the security of the true church. In fact they are exerting a mighty influence to stop the progress of every great error, and to reclaim and purify even the churches which have given heed to lying vanities.

If then there were danger that some of our theological students would imbibe the errors of the writers in question, there would, in the present condition and prospects of the American church, be little to fear.

But Christians need not apprehend many apostasies from the true faith among our theological students in consequence of reading the German writers, even if there were no guard against it in the circumstances of the church. The errors of the authors are well understood in the general, before their writings are consulted, and there is a distinct and fixed object in view, which is to take the benefit of their attainments in all the branches of knowledge auxiliary to the grand business of interpreting the Bible, while there is not the least regard to their philosophical dogmas, which it must be remembered are the great source of all the loose and erroneous doctrines they advance. The student goes to their works knowing that he will have the task of separating the precious from the vile, of sifting the wheat from the chaff.

Were the danger, however, much greater, it would probably on the whole be expedient to hazard it. Such is the present state of theological discussion in our country, and such is the nature of the arguments and objections by which the defender of the truth is now assail-

ed, that he must arm himself at all points, and he will be able to draw from these writers important assistance. He will ever find among them a few strong supporters of orthodoxy, whose writings are peculiarly valuable, especially those of the later authors who have written in view of all the doctrines of the modern rationalists and liberalists. Such was Dr. Storr, chief author of the work of which Professor Schmucker has given us a translation.

Storr lived while the Liberalists were in their greatest glory, and may justly be considered as the chief restorer and supporter of the orthodox faith in Germany. His name has long been familiar to the Biblical student. One of his minor pieces, the *Essay on the Historical Sense of the New Testament*, was several years ago put into an English dress, and somewhat extensively circulated. His *Doctrina Christiana* had found a place in the libraries of almost all our recent theologians, and when Mr. Schmucker's intention to translate it was announced, it was received with great pleasure by many, who have waited with some impatience for the completion of the work.

Before proceeding to a particular notice of this work, it may be suitable to glance very slightly at the state of theological and biblical opinions in Germany when the work was composed, and the steps which had led to their adoption.

The original creed of the Lutheran church was substantially orthodox, as is shown by her symbolical books. Subscription to these was required of all candidates for the ministry or for a degree in theology, and of all laymen on accepting any official situation, and in a few of the States they were guarded by severe pains and penalties. Some of the German writers consider that the symbolical books had an influence in holding together the church

down nearly to the middle of the last century. But in the middle of the seventeenth century a subscription or oath with some reservation began to be allowed, the person being required to assent to them only 'quatenus cum S. S. concordant.'

During the first century, (from the middle of the sixteenth, to the middle of the seventeenth,) the divines remained generally true to the faith of the reformers. The chief subjects of discussion and disputation were the points in controversy between the Protestants and the Catholics, and in the grand essentials of orthodoxy all were united. A spirit of controversy however had begun to burn between the Lutherans and Calvinists, which soon rose to such a height and produced such unhappy dissensions, that several excellent men made great efforts for a union of the two churches. One of the warmest advocates of union was Calixtus, a professor in the University of Helmstadt, whose zeal and writings in this cause occasioned what is called the *syncretistic* controversy, in which torrents of abusive scurrility were poured upon him, although in every respect one of the most eminent divines of the age. The bigotry displayed in this dispute by the Lutheran clergy created disgust in liberal and reflecting minds, especially as a melancholy number of the clergy, so far from manifesting the piety of Christians, actually indulged in immoral and vicious habits, for which the most rigid and punctilious adherence to the ancient symbols of their faith could make no atonement. Here we think it more than probable was the first germ of that poisonous plant, which has spread its roots and twined its tendrils so fatally among the foundations and around the columns of the Lutheran church. Many, weary of the strifes, and disgusted at the inconsistencies of the angry disputants, and beginning to despise their Aristotelian method of treating the-

ological subjects, chose to retire from the field of controversy, and pursue, with a criminal indifference to the practical interests of religion, those liberal studies which had been growing in popularity from the commencement of the reformation. In opposition, on the one hand, to those who with so much indifference to religion gave themselves to the pursuit of learning and science, and on the other, to those who placed so much stress upon the thorough orthodoxy of their faith, arose the *Pietists*. It was the grand object of the good men of this school to render religion an efficacious principle, to exhibit it as designed to control the heart and the life. Hence their doctrine that the word of God is understood only when the heart is affected by a divine influence, and the inference which some of the disciples soon made, but which by no means follows, that all human attainments are useless. Had all to whom this name was applied been such men, or cherished only such principles as *Spener* of Berlin, or *Franck* of Halle, the Lutheran church would have had great occasion to be grateful for the rise of the sect. But the *colleges of piety*, as their private meetings were called, unfortunately were frequented by religionists of the most fanatical and disorganizing principles. The consequence was that both in Germany and abroad, the name of Pietism came at last to be associated with the wildest enthusiasm, and whenever presented brought to mind, in a woful train of recollections, the stubborn prejudices of *Arnold*, the acrimonious bile of *Dippelius*, the romantic follies of *Petersen* and his visionary wife, the mystic dreams of *Jacob Behmen*, the star-gazing reveries of *Paul Nagel*, and the ridiculous pretensions of *Christopher Kotter* and *Anne Vetter*, with the whole brotherhood and sisterhood of delirious prophets.

The only effect therefore, which

Pietism could produce as to the party which had begun to swerve from the strictness and spirituality of the primitive reformers, was to alienate them still more from every thing favouring the peculiarities of evangelical religion, and induce them to look abroad for principles more congenial to the cold speculations of reason and philosophy. They began accordingly, in the former part of the eighteenth century, to study the writings of the Polish Socinians, the English Deists, and the French Literati, and soon imbibed many of their pernicious notions.

This, co-operating with the natural effect of Pietism, led the more orthodox party to a higher cultivation of philosophy, and an attempt to build their system of faith upon principles more purely demonstrative. Leibnitz and Wolf were the founders of the *philosophical* school, and their system, although it was at first opposed, (Wolf being even expelled from his office in the university of Halle on account of his principles,) yet before long gained numerous and vehement admirers, who laboured with great assiduity and ardor in applying it to support the doctrines of religion. The disciples of this school produced metaphysical and even mathematical demonstrations of the Trinity, the nature of Christ, and the duration of future punishment. One of them commenced a new version of the Bible, prefixing to it a system of theology drawn up in geometrical order, which was to guide him in interpreting the sacred writers. It is impossible to say how much these efforts contributed to nourish the same mistaken views as to the power and province of human reason, which were fostered by the deistical studies of the other class of theologians just mentioned; but it certainly must appear probable that they tended in no small degree to intro-

duce that disposition, which became so general about the middle of the century, to unite the doctrines of scripture with the discoveries of reason; to connect Christianity with natural religion; to give, in short, to the whole gospel a rational and philosophical dress.

Just at this juncture appeared the bold innovator, who has the undisputed honour of being the father of the *modern Liberalism*. Semler was brought up in the midst of the Pietists, and although he caught none of the ardour of their religious feelings, nor of their indifference to human learning, he imbibed a double portion of their contempt for formal creeds and symbols. Nature gave him a most powerful mind, and he stored it richly with the fruits of diligent, various, and extensive research; but both his talents and learning were most grossly abused in devising and defending the theories of a subtle and perverse ingenuity. His doctrines soon attracted universal attention, and obtained an astonishing degree of approbation and influence. He attacked the symbols of the church in a most violent manner, and from this period they ceased to have any power. He attacked the canon of scripture, and shortly had followers who stripped the whole Bible of its claims to divine authority. He started the doctrine of *accommodation*, and in the hands of his disciples it proved a most fearful engine in sweeping away every valuable principle of religion. The new light rapidly spread. Writers multiplied. Speculation grew in audacity. Ere long it was ascertained that miracles are an absolute impossibility, inspiration a downright absurdity, nearly all that Jesus ever did or said was in condescension and adaptation to the ignorance and prejudice of the Jews, most that was written by the apostles was little better than blunder or falsehood, the ac-

count of the creation was merely a philosophical fable, and the history of Christ a new mythology, like the incarnations of Vishnoo.

Such were the speculations of the school of Semler. No serious mind can think of them but with disgust. Yet more or less of this indecency and profaneness is found in nearly all the Commentaries, Biblical Antiquities, Introductions, and Hermeneutical or Dogmatical systems, which deluded Germany at the close of the last century. It deserves to be noticed too, that these pernicious doctrines were not confined to writings designed merely for scholars and divines. They were embodied and circulated in popular treatises, and in periodical publications, which carried the poison throughout the community. They were boldly and impiously avowed and proclaimed in the Lutheran pulpits. They were taught in the Gymnasia and Universities to every class of the youth. They were even infused into the elementary books of instruction, of which we will give one example in a work of Becker, called a '*Universal History for the Young*.'—This contained a chapter on Christianity, in which the evangelists are styled the *wretched* biographers of Jesus. John the Baptist and Jesus are represented as artful *emissaries* of the sect of Essenes, who secretly supported them; the account of the crucifixion is pronounced a *mere tale*, and the miracles of the New Testament, termed in general *concerted fabrications*.

It was no wonder therefore that a great indifference to all religious subjects, and consequently a low tone of moral feeling, should soon pervade the country. It was no wonder that the lower classes, where there remained any seriousness and religion, should turn again to the writings and system of the Pietists for something to satisfy and sustain their feelings, or

that those in the higher ranks should begin to look with favour upon the worship and ceremonies of the Catholic church as most congenial to religious emotion, and actually desert, as numbers did, the ranks of the Protestants. It was no wonder that some of the more reflecting should come forward with new systems of philosophy, supporting religion and morals not upon any grounds of reason or deductions of argument, but upon intuition and original feeling. These systems, although opposed for the most part to the scheme of rationalism, are by no means calculated to promote correct views of theology or practical religion. *Kant* often advocates the cause of the scriptures and the old orthodox faith, and is frequently quoted with respect by Storr, but his views tend too much to mysticism and Platonism to be followed with advantage or safety. *Schelling*, whose system is we believe, the latest in vogue in that land of systems and theories, is a violent opposer of the Rationalists, comparing them to the unhappy beings whom Dante places "in the foreground of the mansion of woe, rejected by heaven yet not received by hell;" but his philosophy, besides being exceedingly vague and mystical, is directly atheistic in its tendencies, teaching that the existence of man and of spirits is nothing real, except as it is identical with the existence of God, and that in fact, neither exists out of the Divine Being.

In such a state of things as resulted from the principles of Semler, nothing could be more desirable for the cause of religion, than that some man of piety, talents, and suitable Biblical attainments should be found to resist the flood of mischief swelling on every side. It was at this time that Storr came forward to overthrow the foundations of the liberal school, being every way qualified for his task. He was as

thoroughly versed in criticism and antiquities as any of his adversaries, and had an important advantage over them in being much better acquainted with the Bible as a connected whole. He did not make the display, or attract the admiration, which attended the first efforts of Semler. But Liberalism received from his hand a salutary check. In his treatise on the historical sense, he demolished the whole scheme of *accommodation*, and compelled the party to resort to other grounds to defend their interpretations and doctrines. In other pieces he successfully and triumphantly attacked other errors of the Rationalists. His system of theology, which was purely Biblical, was the most solid and effectual contribution towards the support of the primitive faith of the Lutheran church, which she had received for more than a century. And the influence of his writings has not ceased; they are co-operating with the writings of living authors and with other causes, to purge out the abominations of that infidel philosophy, whose pernicious sway we have just exhibited. The modern orthodox school embraces some of the most respectable names, among which may be mentioned Reinhardt, Meyer, Flatt, De Wette, Winer, Wahl, and Tholuck. The system of Rationalism is unquestionably on the decline. Some of its advocates have openly renounced it. Others choose not to defend it. The appointments in the universities begin to be given to men of more serious views and feelings. A better day may soon be expected to shine upon the German churches.

But we must hasten to give some account of the work before us. The translation is made from the edition in German with notes and additions by Flatt, which is much more valuable to those for whom the translation was intended than

any of the Latin editions. The work consists of five books; *the first* treating of the authority of the scriptures; *the second*, of God, his works and providence, and his existence as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; *the third*, of angels, good and evil, and of man, his original state, his fall, the character of his posterity, the punishment to which they are exposed in the future world, the provision for their salvation through the atonement, their final separation to heaven and hell according to their use of the privileges of a probationary life; *the fourth*, of Christ as Redeemer, his person and different states of existence, his works on earth, (under which the nature and efficacy of his atonement are examined) and his works since the ascension, (under which is considered the whole subject of the church, its ministry and sacraments); *the fifth*, of justification and reformation by change of heart and life as connected with salvation. The manner of the author is to state in the briefest terms what he considers the exact testimony of the Bible on the several points, referring to the proof texts, and in his notes referring to the opinions and arguments of others. In the German, the notes of Flatt are built upon those of Storr. Mr. Schmucker has incorporated both together, and they follow the text in the form of illustrations, which greatly improves the perspicuity and the interest of the work.

We consider the first book, which contains the proof of the genuineness, integrity, authenticity, and inspiration, of the scriptures, as by far the most valuable part of the whole. It was necessary for Storr to give this subject a thorough investigation, as the divine authority of the Bible was rejected by the great body of the Liberalists of the age. Many of them freely admitted that the doctrines of orthodoxy were plainly taught in the sacred

books, but openly declared that no reader was under obligation on that account to adopt them. We fully believe that the Unitarians of this country will be compelled to avow the same opinion; indeed we apprehend they do not now as a body feel bound to believe what is taught in the *Epistles*; they make a distinction between what was *spoken by Christ*, and what was *written by the early teachers*; and unless we have been greatly misled as to their views, by what we have read in their publications and heard from their pulpits, there are among them those who do not consider any of the writings even of the New Testament as in any proper sense *inspired*: they take them not as *being themselves a revelation from God*, but only as *a history of such a revelation*, a history written indeed with great candour and fairness, and by persons probably competent for the work, but still a history liable like every other history to contain mistakes or errors even as to grand points connected with its main subject. Now our expectation long has been that they would ultimately avow this, that they would change the ground of attack upon the opinions of the orthodox, and deny the claims of the writers of the New Testament to implicit belief on the points in dispute. And the sooner this ground is taken the better; better for the truth, for it will tend very directly to open the eyes of many who are now blinded by their professed regard for the Bible, and better in some respects for the advocates of the heresy too, for it will free them from the embarrassment under which they evidently now suffer in their controversial efforts, lest they should too incautiously betray to the mass of the people their real opinions as to the authority of the scriptures. But whenever they may gather their forces and marshal them for a contest on this ground,

we think they will meet with their usual success, which (we are sorry for their sake and for the sake of their reputed learning and talents, although for the truth's sake and for righteousness sake most glad to say it,) has been defeat and disaster. The argument of Storr on this subject is conducted in a masterly manner and with irresistible evidence, and if our young theologians shall ever need to look around for the weapons of such a warfare they will find here a well stored armory.

Of the rest of the work the grand excellence, and we must add the only very important excellence, is its *Biblical character*. Every position and statement has its scriptural proof, and in adducing texts the author is most scrupulously attentive to their pertinency and authority. He even goes to the extreme of quoting for proof only from the *homologoumena*, introducing passages, from the *antilegomena* merely for illustration. The investigations are conducted throughout on strictly philological principles. It is chiefly because the work is thus *Biblical*, that it deserves so far as it is a system of theology, the attention of the student. The great defect of most popular theological systems is, that they contain too much of the author and too little of the Bible. The same has been true of theological controversies. They have too often been a trial of skill in metaphysics, rather than a simple appeal to the law and the testimony. And we doubt not, that he whose province it is to bring good out of evil, designed it as a chief good which should result from the controversy with the rationalists of modern times, that it should bring the advocates of truth to contend for it on the simple basis of the word of God. Such has been the effect of the Unitarian controversy in Germany. Such, eminently, has been its tendency in this

country. It has agitated, mainly, not the question whether the scriptures be a revelation from God: that was discussed and settled with the infidels of a former age; and the discussion probably will not soon need to be repeated, at least in the English language. But the great question now has been, What is contained in the scriptures? The fact of a revelation being admitted. What are we taught by it? This is the fundamental question; and the progress of the discussion has created a growing attention to the Bible. It has greatly modified and improved our systems of theological education, and has had a beneficial influence on the thinking and writing habits of the age, in respect to theological subjects. It has, in a word, tended to give the Bible its proper eminence above the speculative systems of men. Abstracts and compends, creeds and catechisms, are indeed useful, yea necessary in their place; but we apprehend that too great a relative importance has been assigned to them in comparison with the simple word of God. We fear that many a confident polemic, both public and private, has been better versed in his tomes of theology than in the Holy Oracles, and that even in the schools of the prophets, instances have not been wanting in which some favorite Body or Marrow of Divinity has practically been made the text-book, instead of the Bible itself.

The reader will not understand us as objecting to a logical arrangement in stating theological truth. So far from this is the fact, that we think the work before us would have been better had there been more regard to such an arrangement. There is one point in particular which we think worthy of notice,—the place where, in a logical succession of topics, the proof of the divine benevolence should fall. It would seem clear upon thorough examination, that this attribute, in-

volving the divine veracity, must be admitted before any arguments can be drawn from the scriptures. For grant that the scriptures are given by inspiration of God, and of course contain his testimony, still unless there is previous satisfaction that his testimony must be true, no argument can be logically founded upon it, and we see not how this satisfaction can arise but from a sufficient proof of the divine benevolence, which will necessarily involve veracity.

It would be unnecessary, if our time permitted, to notice particularly the doctrinal views which the work presents. The reader will be specially pleased with the passages on the Trinity, the nature and efficacy of the atonement, and the future punishment of the wicked. He must expect however to meet in different parts of the work with the Lutheran peculiarities, and he will probably regret that the translator has not only made sixteen pages out of his two authors, in proof of the *real presence*, but has added ten more of his own, to explain and defend the doctrine. He will regret this the more, as probably after the most diligent perusal of the whole, he will be constrained to pronounce it, as Mr. Schmucker himself declares many of the explanations of his brethren to be, "nebulous indeed."

Although we have spoken so highly of the work as exhibiting the divine authority of the scriptures, and as tending to give a more biblical character to theology, we should fail of doing justice if we should omit to mention another consideration, which goes to augment its value, namely, that on many of the controverted subjects it contains statements of the most important objections, and answers to them, with references to authors who may be consulted for farther satisfaction. Yet this part of the work might have been vastly improved by the translator, had he made

greater effort to adapt it to the wants of his readers. In many cases the illustrations are protracted very tediously by the introduction of objections, which it was altogether unnecessary to present in a work adapted to American theologians. And in general the references are confined far too much to German writers. The student is directed to works in a dead or foreign language, and works, which will long, perhaps always, lie beyond his reach, while others in his native tongue, and easily procured, are not mentioned. For instance, on the internal evidences for the New Testament scriptures, (compare § 5. Ill. 4 and § 16. Ill. 4.) we are referred only to Morus, Less, Stæudlin, Tøllner, Werenfels, Bengel, Kleuker, Kœppen, and Paulus, while on the internal evidence of *credibility*, Lardner and Paley, stand unrivalled, and on that of *divineness* the little treatise of Erskine contains a clearer and more convincing argument than was ever written or conceived by a German. So in the illustrations of the sections on the existence of God (§§ 17—20.) we hear of Brastberger, and Fries, and Fichte, and Forberg, and Gabler, and Vogel, and we cannot say how many more, while there is not an allusion to one of those able, ample, sterling, English authors, who have given the argument for the divine existence every possible elucidation. Indeed we should suppose that the translator imagined himself all along to be at work as much for a German student as his original authors, for even where they refer to a German translation of an English book he has most scrupulously retained the reference to the translation instead of the original. And Mr. Schmucker must not complain of us as forgetting that he only undertook the business of translating, for his title page speaks of *additions*, which term is comprehensive enough to include something at least, of the improvement we have hinted at over and

above his two appendixes, and his extracts from works so rare as the Letters of Stuart and Woods.

In conclusion we recommend the "Biblical Theology" to the use and study of all who wish to cultivate habits of sound investigation. To the readers who seek for the flow of eloquence, or the ornaments of taste, it will present a forbidding aspect, as there is throughout a rigid adherence to the driest style of didactic statement. It was not intended at all for hasty perusal; it must be carefully studied. The volumes will be altogether out of place in the hands of the superficial, declaiming, popular theologian; they belong to the patient, noiseless, diligent reader of the Bible. The student will find nothing in them to inspire his admiration, but he will consider them as a highly valuable addition to his theological treasures.

The Doctrine of Incest stated, with an Examination of the Question, Whether a Man may Marry his deceased Wife's Sister: in a Letter to a Clergyman of the Presbyterian Church. By DOMESTICUS. Carlisle, Pa. 1826. pp. 47, 8vo.

"Is it lawful for a man to marry his deceased wife's sister?" An often agitated question, both in ecclesiastical and civil councils. Both have generally decided against it. Yet instances of transgression have been so numerous, and so plausibly vindicated by argument, that legislatures, in many, perhaps a majority of cases, have either repealed, at length, their enactments, or suffered them to sink into a dead letter, while ecclesiastical assemblies have ever and anon been engaged in a fresh discussion of the subject. Such is the fact at present in the Presbyterian Church. At the last session of the General Assembly an appeal was brought to that body by a Mr.

McCrimmon, who, having married a sister of his deceased wife, had been suspended from the communion of the church. Relief could not be granted without the erasure of a certain clause in the Confession of Faith. That clause declares that "the man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own."† The General Assembly, however, considering that "a diversity of opinion and practice obtains on this very important subject," resolved to refer it to the presbyteries; whose answers are to be sent up in writing to the next General Assembly, whether the prohibitory clause quoted above shall or shall not be erased from the Confession. The question is therefore to be made a matter of "serious consideration" throughout the Presbyterian Church. And the sense of that most respectable denomination, thus extensively collected, will not only have great weight with its sister Churches, but will materially affect the opinions of the community at large. The question itself, apart from the present interest which it thus derives from circumstances, is believed to be one of no fictitious or slight importance. A decision in the case is necessary. If the prohibited marriage be in itself right, no conventional act of men can make it wrong; and the innocent ought not to suffer the imputation of a crime which is merely imaginary. If, on the other hand, the marriage in question be wrong, ecclesiastical courts and legislatures should be cautious how they sanction a practice which, as many seriously regard it, is contrary to the dictates of nature, and opposed by a divine prohibition. And whether the practice be right or wrong, ministers and churches ought to be settled on an important and often

recurring question of church discipline.

The doings of the General Assembly, above referred to, occasioned the pamphlet before us. Its author is understood to be a highly respectable clergyman of that denomination. It has been sent to us in the last of the month, with a request, from different quarters, that it might be noticed in our forthcoming number. Those who feel an interest in the subject, and in the author's manner of treating it, are desirous that his argument should be brought under the consideration of others, as far as may be, before the approaching decision of the General Assembly. We have therefore turned our hasty attention to it; and if the author shall think our abstract of his half a hundred pages very imperfect, our apology must be, that we are compelled to send it as it is written, in rapid and unrevised paragraphs, to the printers.

Those who found their objections to the marriage of a wife's sister upon the word of God, refer us to the 18th chapter of Leviticus. They find it there forbidden, at the 16th verse, to marry a brother's widow; and as the relation of the man to his brother's wife is the same as the relation of the woman to her sister's husband, they conceive that the prohibition plainly extends to the latter case. To this passage, thus understood, the Confession of Faith refers us, in support of the clause we have quoted. Our author however regards the argument from Scripture as entirely inconclusive. For, first, he does not find the supposed prohibition in the *words* of the Levitical law; the *constructive* reasoning from the 16th verse he considers too vague and indeterminate to set the matter at rest; and the 18th verse, he supposes, does not touch the question. And secondly, admitting that the alleged prohibition *were* contained in the law of Moses,

† Chap. XXIV. Sect. 4.

in literal and express terms ; or that it were incontestibly made out by inference from the chapter and verse referred to, it is denied to be decisive. For the Levitical code *as a system*, has ceased to be of force. It is obligatory on us, our author avers, so far only as it agrees with our circumstances. In other words, if the *reason* of a particular Mosaic precept exists at the present day, the precept itself is binding ; otherwise, it is among the things that have passed away. And this is to be determined by common sense ;—which is, in effect, to settle nothing by the authority of the Mosaic code, but to make that code itself subject to the decisions of human judgment.

Our author, then, professes not to regard at all the Mosaic law of incest, be its decisions what they may, touching the Jews ; but he looks “ at the *reason* of that code, and of every law of incest that answers the design of its institution.” Within certain degrees of affinity marriage is not permitted. Why ? Because of the necessary *intimacy* of such relations, and the consequent danger to their morals, without the prohibition. If the male and female members of a family, dwelling together in the most familiar manner, were to regard each other in the light of future wedlock, *improprieties* would be the consequence ; and the only way to guard against the evil is to make them sacred to each other. The very thought of crime must be shut out from their bosoms by making marriage itself, between them, an utter abomination. This then is the reason of the law of incest. It is designed to protect the purity of families ; and it thus becomes the great safeguard of the institution of marriage, and the great preserver of general chastity. “ It is an expedient for guarding against a species of criminality which would destroy society in its fountains.”

Without this expedient, the institu-

tion of marriage could not exist ; families would become domestic brothels ; and the world would hasten to antediluvian corruption. If we use strong language, our author's is still stronger ; and what we are endeavouring to do is to give the substance of his argument.

Viewed in this light, the whole ground of the prohibition is resolved simply into a matter of *general expediency* : and the prohibition itself may be stated, as our author states it, in another form, thus ; “ You shall not marry those with whom you are destined to hold constant, tender, and familiar intercourse,”—whether they are related to you by blood or not. The objection arises solely from the degree of *intimacy* which, from the structure of human society, will necessarily subsist between the persons prohibited. Consanguinity is not the *ground* of the prohibition, and has nothing to do with the matter, except as it is the *occasion* of bringing the persons forbidden to marry, into that dangerous freedom of intercourse which renders the prohibition necessary. “ It is not,” says the author, “ the consanguinity, but its *effects*,—the opportunities and temptations which flow from it, that the legislator has exclusively in his eye. Nothing therefore is more absurd than that minute comparison of degrees of proximity, that careful balancing and discrimination between the shades of blood relationship, by which many set about determining questions of this sort, as if there was a charm in *blood*, or other bodily secretions. I grant, consanguinity is a most useful guide to us, in framing our prohibitions ; for this plain reason, that persons thus connected may be fairly presumed to live in a state of familiarity. It is a sign of the *presence of those evils* which we wish to guard against,—and ought to be consulted. But it is not the evil itself, and therefore if the form and habits of society

give full reason to believe that the danger exists *without* the usual sign, the law, in all such cases, should be vigorously applied." Consequently, if the form of society were supposed to be changed, the law must undergo a corresponding modification. If for example, families were composed of persons unrelated by blood, living together from childhood, by a mutual arrangement of parents; or if they were so many domestic corporations, formed by a public distribution of the people according to a principle which should bring strangers together, and separate near relations,—then the law of incest would apply to the families thus artificially formed, while the separated children of the same parents might without impropriety, be united in wedlock. This is the principle of the author's reasoning; and "it is curious to observe," he remarks, "how the codes of different nations recognise this principle almost instinctively;"—of which he gives a number of examples. One is sufficient for the purpose of illustration.

Among the eastern nations the marriage of a sister by the mother's side was regarded as incestuous, while such a connexion with a sister by the father's side was not so regarded. This latter relation Sarah sustained to Abraham:—she was the daughter of his father, but not the daughter of his mother. The explanation given is the following. The women among those nations (as is still the case where polygamy prevails) had their separate apartments, each living with her own children. Between the son and daughter of the same mother, therefore, there was the intimacy of family intercourse, and hence they might not marry. If they were but half-brother and sister, that is, if either was the child of the former husband, it did not alter the case, since it did not remove them from the same domestic circle. But in

the case of a half-sister by the father's side, circumstances were different. She lived in the retirement of a separate apartment, or a separate tent; and in respect to freedom of intercourse, she was no more to her half-brother by another woman than a cousin, or a common acquaintance. Therefore they might marry.

Apply now the principle to the particular case under consideration. A man may not marry his wife's sister. Why? Because, says one. I find such a connexion forbidden in the Bible, between those who sustain to each other a precisely similar relation, and hence I infer its unlawfulness in the present case. But this, says "Domesticus," is not the proper answer; for sameness of relation does not, fundamentally, concern the case. It is not a question of *blood*, but of *intercourse*. We are to look, then, at the degree of intimacy which, as society is constituted, is likely to subsist between the husband and sister-in-law. This is shown to be unrestrained. When a man enters into the marriage connexion he becomes identified with the family of his wife. He visits the home of her sisters with all the freedom of one belonging to the their own domestic circle. His house is equally familiar to them. They enter it at all times without restraint or ceremony, and for months and weeks together are its most familiar guests. But this is not all. In thousands of instances they actually become members of his family. Bereavement or adversity has deprived them of a parental home, and they have come to him for protection. They spend their days in quietness beneath his roof. They become identified with the wife herself in all the offices and interests of the domestic circle. They are her assistants in health, her attendants in sickness, the nursing-mothers of her children. And on all this scene of affection and con-

fidence the shadows of suspicion never fall. But why is it thus?

What is it in the first place, can persuade the wife to receive into the family, a stranger to her husband, of whose unconquerable virtue to say the least she has no proof, induces her to put this stranger at once on a footing of perfect familiarity, repose in her unlimited confidence, leave the house to her sole direction for weeks and months, while she is lying on her sick bed, confident that all is going well on each side of her,—the thought never crossing her imagination, that her husband (the man perhaps whom she suspects of weekly visiting a brothel) may seize the opportunity for executing an infamous design?—What is it in the next place, enables the sister-in-law to throw herself with confidence in this new circle,—to become domesticated in it,—to feel pure and happy and affectionate,—to love all, and to love more and more, till her very soul is melted into the souls of those around her?—What lastly, enables the husband, no matter how young and fair the object that is continually flitting before him, employed in offices of kindness,—to regard her with love indeed, but with the love of Plato's disembodied spirits,—as pure, as fervent, and as seraphic? Talk not to me of a natural sense of propriety. It is idle. The true Guardian Genius is the *Law of Incest*, which unknown to the parties themselves, is watching and casting its ample shield about them, in their sleeping and waking—in their eating and drinking,—in their public walks,—and in the darkest retreats of the family mansion. Abolish this law; expel this household god: Let it be publicly and distinctly understood that the body of a sister-in-law, is no more than *any other* female body, and to do this, you need only let the parties understand that after the death of the present wife *they may marry*; what will follow?—pp. 32-33.

We have now endeavoured to exhibit, correctly we hope, though very briefly, our author's theory of the law of incest, and its application to the case under consideration. In running hastily over his pamphlet, we have noted down queries and suggestions miscellaneously, as they occurred to us. Hav-

ing no time to examine or digest them we shall let them stand as they are; since queries and suggestions may be safely made in haste, while theories and opinions demand maturity of reflection.

In the first place then, our queries have respect to the ground taken by the author in reference to the Bible. If the Bible be closed on the subject, argument, we apprehend, will be fruitless. The deductions of philosophy will not bind the consciences of men, nor control their practice. Every one will be his own judge in the case. Let us therefore look at the passage in Scripture which is denied to contain the alleged prohibition. In the xviii. chapter of Leviticus we find it forbidden a man to marry his grand-daughter, his aunt, his daughter-in-law, &c. But nothing is said concerning a woman's marrying her grand-son, her uncle, or her son-in-law. Were connexions of this latter class, then, lawful, according to the Jewish code? Our author answers, yes. At least, his principle leads to this conclusion. Indeed he says expressly (p. 23,) that a niece might marry her uncle, while such a connexion between a nephew and aunt was positively forbidden. And the philosophical reason which he gives, for this apparent inconsistency, is, that according to Jewish manners, there was not the same degree of intimacy to be guarded against in the one case as in the other.

But others are not prepared to go along with him in his exegetical conclusions respecting the Jewish code. For however correct his theory may be, abstractly considered, it does not properly enter into a critical examination of the code in question; because, though the theory may be just, in a philosophical view of the subject, it does not affect the reason which is actually assigned for the prohibitions specified in the Levitical law. The reason there assigned is *nearness*

of kindred. There might be another reason back of this, but the lawgiver did not see fit to make it the guide in practice. If then, to take the case in debate, a certain degree of affinity existed between a man and his brother's widow, and this *affinity*—not *the degree of intimacy* which might pertain to such a relationship—was made the ground of the prohibition respecting them, the same affinity subsisting between the man and his wife's sister, created the same reason for extending the prohibition to them. So in regard to each of the other instances mentioned. A specific case was given and the reason assigned; its application to a parallel case was obvious, and it was inexpedient to encumber the code by needless repetitions. This we take to be a legitimate view of the subject. But admitting that the prohibition under consideration is fairly shown to be contained in the Jewish code, it is denied to be decisive, inasmuch as that code has become antiquated. The shortest answer we can frame to this objection, in our short time and space, is, that that code does at least contain such a *record* of the will of God on the subject as makes it applicable to all mankind. He enforces it on the Jews, by telling them that he abhorred the nations which practised what was here forbidden. And however the prohibition of such marriages may be averred to have been ceremonial in respect to the Jews, it cannot be so considered in its application to the gentiles.

Further, if *relationship* be in any sense the ground of the prohibitory law, the law is equally extensive as the ties of kindred. But from this our author dissents. He supposes, as we understand him, that there is no natural aversion in men to the kind of connexions forbidden. "The only horror felt is generated by the law." But this conclusion we think demands a query. As to the general reason which existed

in the divine mind for instituting this class of prohibitions, the author's theory may, and probably does, involve the right one. But as to the motive which acts, and was designed to act, immediately upon the minds of men, it may be questioned whether the theory does not exclude it. The law under consideration was designed to perform a most important and difficult office. It must be of sufficient power to annihilate, within certain limits, one of the strongest propensities of human nature, and must exercise its control, unceasingly, universally, and over every description of moral character. Now is it probable that the Father of the human family would leave so important an interest to the efficiency of human reason? or even to the unaided authority of his own positive injunctions? Reason alone would teach a parent the duty of educating his offspring; but in how great a proportion of instances would reason secure obedience, even in view of a divine precept? It was necessary, therefore, to place within him a more efficient motive, in those instinctive feelings which bind him to his kindred. For it cannot be denied, we think, that what is termed *natural affection* is a part of our original nature. Is it not then a very probable hypothesis, that *with* those mysterious ties of kindred which exist in every human bosom, the author of our nature has closely associated certain *other* instinctive feelings in reference to the subject we have been considering. And how do facts corroborate this hypothesis. How rare is transgression of the kind alluded to. It is a monstrous anomaly in crime—abhorred even by the lowest, as a wrong done to nature! But it will be asked how this principle applies to brothers and sisters *in law*? There are no such ties of nature between them. The relationship is merely artificial. Our answer is, the instinctive feeling operates

through the relative that *is* connected by birth, with one or the other of the parties. This feeling, thus operating, seems to have been regarded by the Jewish lawgiver; and the fact accounts perhaps for the peculiarity of his language. We regard this hypothesis as of great practical importance. For if men can once bring themselves to view the prohibited connexions as only the transgression of a *general law of expediency*, the crime will in a great measure lose its horribleness.

But we cannot enlarge. Other suggestions we had in mind, but having beforehand limited ourselves to a given space, we are compelled to stop. We are already trenching on matter in type. Respecting the treatise of Domesticus we will say in a word, that it is novel, ingenious, and able; and that whoever reads it will be strengthened in the opinion that the marriage of a wife's sister is not lawful. We regret that the *language* of the pamphlet had not been more select and delicate.

LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL INTELLIGENCE.

PROFESSOR UPHAM, of Bowdoin College, translator of Jahn's Archaeology, has in press a new work on Intellectual Philosophy, intended as a textbook for colleges and academies.

Twenty-five thousand dollars have been obtained by subscription for the purpose of erecting a new college edifice, and endowing a Professorship at Williams College. The edifice is to include a chapel, and rooms for recitation, the library, cabinet, &c. Professor Porter, of the University of Vermont, is elected to the Professorship.

The Rev. James Marsh, late Professor at Hampden Sidney, has been inaugurated as President of Vermont University.

The Rev. Francis Wayland, Professor at Union College, has been elected to the Presidency of Brown University, and is expected to enter on the duties of that office in the Spring.

Mr. Madison, successor to Mr. Jefferson as Rector of the University of Virginia, in his Annual Report states,

that since the Report last made, the acquisition of a Professor of Law has completed the number required for the existing arrangement, and the matriculated students have increased to 177; the state of the schools being,—In the school of Ancient Languages, 90; Mathematics, 98; Natural Philosophy, 43; Natural History, 45; Anatomy and Medicine, 16; Moral Philosophy, 28; Law, (opened in July) 26; The next session will commence Feb. 1st, and terminate July 4th. All future sessions will commence Aug. 20th, and terminate July 4th; with one recess from the 15th to the 31st of December.

Kenyon College, Ohio, founded by Bishop Chase, has commenced its course of literary and theological instruction with thirty students.

Washington Irving is said to have discovered some important documents relative to his life of Columbus, which after some discouragement, he is now prosecuting with fresh diligence. He is attached to the family of Mr. Everett, American minister at Madrid.

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

RELIGIOUS.

A Sermon, delivered before the Vermont Colonization Society, at Montpelier, October 18, 1826. By John

Hough, Professor of Languages in Middlebury College. Published by request of the Society. Montpelier.

A Sermon, preached before the Ver-

mont Domestic Missionary Society, at the Annual Meeting, held at Castle-ton, September 14, 1826. By John Wheeler, Pastor of the First Congregational Church, Windsor. Windsor, Vt.

The Doctrine of Incest stated, with an Examination of the Question, whether a man may marry his deceased Wife's Sister: in a Letter to a clergyman of the Presbyterian Church. By Domesticus. Carlisle, Pa.

An Address to the flocks of the Reverend Approvers of Blanco White's Internal Evidences against Catholicism. Baltimore. Fielding Lucas & Co.

A Sermon on the Apostolic Mission and the Doctrine of Baptism. By the Rev. George Atkins. Knoxville, Tennessee.

A Sermon on the occasion of the Death of the Rev. Oliver Morris, preached in Christ's Church, Alexandria, on Sunday, 18th of September, 1825. By the Rev. William Meade.

Letters on the Religious Notions of A. Campbell and others, as exhibited in their Writings, Orations, &c. addressed particularly to the Baptists comprising the Mahoning Association. By a Regular Baptist. Ravenna, Ohio.

St. Chrysostom on the Priesthood. Translated from the original Greek, with Notes and a Life of the Fathers, by the Rev. Henry M. Mason, A. M. Rector of St. John's Church, Fayetteville, North Carolina. Philadelphia. E. Littell.

Immortality proved by the Testimony of Sense; in which is contemplated the Doctrine of Spectres, and the Existence of a particular Spectre. By Abraham Cumming, A. M. Price 40 cents. Bath, Me.

Letters on the Gospels. By Miss Hannah Adams. Second Edition. Cambridge. 18mo. pp. 160.

MISCELLANEOUS.

An Epitome of Geography, with an Atlas. By J. E. Worcester. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, and others.

Memoirs of Ministers and other deceased Members of the Society of Friends, State of New-York.

Essays upon Popular Education; containing a Particular Examination of the Schools of Massachusetts, and

Vol. I.—No. I.

an Outline of an Institution for the Education of Teachers. By James G. Carter. Boston. Bowles & Dearborn. 8vo. pp. 60.

The Class-Book of American Literature; consisting principally of Selections in the Departments of History, Biography, Prose, Fiction, Poetry, &c. from the Best Writers of our own Country. Designed to be used as a Reading-Book in American Schools. By John Frost. Boston. J. H. A. Frost. 12mo. pp. 288.

A Spanish Grammar, dedicated to the Youth of North America. By A. De Letamendi, late Consul of Spain for East Florida. Price \$1.50. Charleston, S. C. W. Riley.

History of the United States, from their First Settlement as Colonies to the close of the war with Great Britain in 1815. New-York. Collins & Hannay. 12mo. pp. 281.

Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the year 1826. Vol. IV. New-York. J. Seymour. 8vo. pp. 308.

Elements of History, Ancient and Modern; with Historical Charts. By J. E. Worcester. Second Edition. Boston. Hilliard, Gray & Co. 12mo. pp. 324.

A Full Report of the Trial of Henry Eckford, Thomas Vermilyea, Joseph G. Swift, William P. Rathbone, and others, for Conspiracy to defraud, &c. Embracing the whole Evidence, and the Speeches of the Counsel on both sides. New-York. pp. 48.

An Elementary Treatise on Plane and Spherical Trigonometry and of the application of Algebra to Geometry; from the Mathematics of Lacroix and Bezout. Translated from the French, for the Use of the Students of the University, Cambridge, N. E. Cambridge, N. E. 8vo. pp. 161.

The Mother's Catechism; containing Common Things necessary to be known at an Early Age. A new Edition, carefully revised and enlarged. Charleston, S. C.

A Discourse on the Western Autumnal Disease; read before the Tenth District Medical Society of Ohio, at Chillicothe, May 30, 1826. By J. W. Vethuke, M. D.

A Narrative of the Material Facts in relation to the building of the two Greek Frigates. By Alexander Constantavlos. New-York. pp. 88.

Report of the Evidence and Reasons of the Award between Johannes Orlandos and Andreas Luriottis, Greek Deputies, on the one part; and LeRoy, Bayard & Co. and G. S. Howland on the other part. By the Arbitrators. New-York. W. E. Dean. pp. 72.

Refutations of the Reasons assigned by the Arbitrators, for their Award in the case of the two Greek Frigates. By H. D. Sedgwick. New-York. J. Seymour.

Address delivered before the Benevolent Society of Bowdoin College, Tuesday Evening, September 5, 1826. By Samuel P. Newman. Portland. Printed at the Mirror Office. 8vo. pp. 29.

Observations on the Sermons of Elias Hicks, in several Letters to him; with some Introductory Remarks, addressed to the Junior Members of the Society of Friends. By a Demi-Quaker.

A Short Inquiry into the Antiquity and Pretensions of Freemasonry, being an Examination of the Freemason's Monitor. Price 25 cents.

Yorktown; an Historical Romance. In Two Volumes. Boston. Wells & Lilly. 12mo. pp. 280 and 255.

Address on Church Music, delivered, by request, on the Evening of Saturday, Oct. 7, 1826, in the Vestry of Hanover-street Church, and on the

evening of Monday following, in the Second Baptist Church, Boston. By Lowell Mason. Boston. Hilliard, Gray & Co. 8vo. pp. 42.

A Discourse delivered on the 24th of October, 1826, before the Society for the Commemoration of the Landing of William Penn. Philadelphia. H. C. Carey & I. Lea. 8vo.

Africa; a Poem. Second Edition. Andover. Flagg & Gould. 12mo.

The keys; a Vision of Samaritanus. Chillicothe, Ohio. 12mo. pp. 54.

The Friend to Health; being a Selection of valuable Truths relating to the Preservation of Health, from the works of Thacher, Franklin, Thompson, Salzmann, &c. Boston. Marsh & Capen. 12mo. pp. 107.

Elnathan; a Narrative illustrative of the Manners of the Ancient Israelites. Philadelphia. 18mo. pp. 136.

Review of Bishop Hobart's Sermon, entitled "The United States of America compared with some European Countries, particularly England," contained in the London Quarterly Theological Review for June, 1826; with two Answers to the same, one in the New-York Christian Journal for October, 1826, and the other in the London Christian Remembrancer for September, 1826. New-York. T. & J. Swords.

MONTHLY RECORD.

RELIGIOUS.

REVIVALS, we rejoice to say, are becoming too numerous in our country to admit of being generally mentioned in our Record; yet such as possess a peculiar interest from the places where they exist, or from other causes, we shall occasionally notice.

A late letter from a clergyman in Georgia, who attended a meeting of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, at Washington, in the latter state, contains some interesting statements, from which we select the following:

"A good work of grace has already commenced in several places in the state.

During Synod, intelligence came from Milledgeville, that a work of grace had commenced among the members of the Legislature. At an anxious meeting, fifteen of them were inquirers, and five or six indulged a hope that they had found the Messiah.

Intelligence was received from Barnwell, S. C. One of the missionaries in the employ of the South Carolina Domestic Missionary Society, discouraged by the small success of a year's labour, had preached his parting sermon. After the meeting, sixteen persons came in great distress of mind, tel-

ling him their feelings, and entreating his prayers and instructions.

The revival in Athens College, Geo. continued until the middle of November, when vacation commenced. At that time thirty students were hopeful subjects of the work. Before they separated, fifty signed a written resolution that they would stedfastly seek for saving faith in Jesus Christ. In the town the work is still progressing.

In Washington, two days before the meeting of Synod, twenty inquirers were present at the first anxious meeting. These meetings were continued every day, and at the sixth meeting between sixty and seventy were present. Sermons were delivered daily to crowded audiences, who by their fixed attention and silent tears, discovered a deep and increasing solemnity.

The Lexington Missionary Society, Ky., were able the last year to procure the labours of but one missionary, and that only for a small portion of time.

Conference of Churches.—Sixteen churches, lately convened, by pastors and delegates, at Newport, N. H., formed themselves into a circular conference, agreeably to the recommendation of the General Association of the state. The conference recommended to all the churches within its limits, the observance of the first day of January as a season of united and special prayer for the Holy Spirit on their churches and congregations.

Sixty-five thousand copies of the Christian Almanac (which ought to be the universal almanac) have been issued by the American Tract Society, for 1827. The types are kept standing for further use. We have seen it stated that *ninety thousand* copies of the Farmer's Almanac, have been published (at Boston) the present year.

"*Israel's Advocate*" is to be discontinued, by a vote of the American Jew's Society.

The Roman Catholic Bishops in England, have lately published a Declaration of the doctrines of their church, and an appeal to their Protestant fellow-countrymen, respecting the misrepresen-

tations and disabilities to which they are subjected. Some paragraphs from these documents have come to us through the Christian Register.—In respect to the civil wrongs of the Catholics the appeal is earnest, just, and forcible. It ought to be successful. We have always wondered at the British policy towards the Catholics. The world is surely old enough to have taught the British Parliament that persecution, instead of crushing, always builds up sects and parties. They are nourished more by clouds than by sunshine.

The Bishops notice the charge that *the Catholic church is opposed to the circulation of the scriptures*,—which they feebly meet as follows.

"The Catholic church has never forbidden or discouraged the reading or the circulation of authentic copies of the sacred Scriptures, in the original languages.

As to the translations of the Holy Scriptures into modern languages, the Catholic church requires that none should be put into the hands of the faithful but such as are acknowledged by ecclesiastical authority to be accurate and conformable to the sense of the originals. There never was a general law of the Catholic church prohibiting the reading of authorized translations of the Scriptures; but considering that many by their ignorance and evil dispositions, have perverted the meaning of the sacred text to their own destruction, the Catholic church has thought it prudent to make a regulation, that the faithful should be guided in this matter by the advice of their respective pastors.

But when the reading and the circulation of the Scriptures are urged and recommended as the entire rule of faith, as the sole means by which men are to be brought to the certain and specific knowledge of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions of Christ; and when the Scriptures so read and circulated are left to the interpretation and private judgment of each individual: then such reading, circulation, and interpretation are forbidden by the Catholic church, because the Catholic church knows that the circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by each one's private judgment, was not the means

ordained by Christ for the communication of the true knowledge of his laws to all nations—she knows that Christianity was established in many countries before one book of the New Testament was written—that it was not by means of the Scriptures that the apostles and their successors converted nations, or any one nation to the unity of the Christian faith—that the unauthorized reading and circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by private judgment, are calculated to lead men to contradictory doctrines on the primary articles of Christian belief; to inconsistent forms of worship, which cannot all be constituent parts of the uniform and sublime system of Christianity; to errors and fanaticism in religion, and to seditions and the greatest disorders in states and kingdoms.”

Converted Jews at Constantinople.—A letter from Professor King to the Secretary of the American Board, dated June, 1826, says, Mr. Wolff has just arrived here, and is now delivering lectures on the different sects in the East. He informs me that there are at Constantinople, five hundred Jews who now profess to believe in Christ, and who came to the knowledge of the truth through Jews, to whom he had preached the Gospel at Jerusalem. Should they prove to be truly converted, it would be one of the most interesting events that has transpired since apostolic times. Some of the believing Rabbies, it is supposed, have been put to death; and the Jews, in a village near Constantinople, assembled after Mr. Wolff's departure from that place, and *crucified a dog*, to express their contempt of Jesus Christ and his death on the cross.

Mr. Wolff expected soon to return again to Palestine.

Donations.

To the American Home Missionary Society in ten weeks from the 7th of October, \$3,632.93.

To the American Bible Society in the month of November, \$1,425.60. Of this sum \$1000 was from the Charleston (S. C.) Bible Society. For Bibles and Testaments sold the Treasurer received \$4,103.61. In all, \$5529.21.

To the American Education Society in the same month \$482.44.

To the American Board of Missions from October 21 to Nov. 21, \$7,872.88, besides legacies, clothing &c.

POLITICAL.

Congress assembled on the sixth of December. The first half of the President's message relates to our commercial concerns with other nations, and the remainder to our fiscal and other domestic affairs. In respect to the former, the most serious difficulty exists in our relations with Great Britain; that Government having not only interdicted the trade of the United States to their West India possessions, but abruptly closed the door of negotiation on the subject.

In noticing the death of the late Emperor Alexander, the President remarks, that the United States have been deprived by that event of a long, tried, steady, and faithful friend. He also states that he has the most satisfactory assurances, that the sentiments of the reigning Emperor towards the United States are altogether conformable to those which had so long and constantly animated his imperial brother.

Georgia.—The government of Georgia appears to have been again engaged in feverish legislation touching their late scheme for an Indian-land lottery. We hear of the Senate preparing to bring two several complaints to the House of Representatives at Washington, against the President of the United States, first for not removing Colonel Crowell from his Indian agency, and secondly, for not arresting and trying General Gaines, notwithstanding that the President had been requested so to do, and that repeatedly, by the Government of Georgia. Whether Governor Troup intends to stand by his arms during the trial of the President we are not informed.

South America.—If an impression were to be taken implicitly from the newspapers, respecting Colombia, it would seem that that republic is in a condition not far removed from anarchy, and that some of the departments are precipitating themselves, and the country into a monarchy, or something worse, under Bolivar. The Liberator himself is made the subject

of much suspicion and reproach. He is represented,—invidiously, as we believe, in his own country, and hastily and ungenerously in this,—as openly aspiring to royalty. The charge, we think, is to be attributed, not so much to *his* ambition, as to that of his more aspiring, but less distinguished fellow-chieftains. He is, in some degree a visionary politician, and hence there may be found among his measures, as in his “Bolivian code,” perhaps, some things which are not exactly consistent with republicanism; but that he is aspiring to a throne, his general course of conduct seems to us to contradict. Suspicions may be just; but for ourselves we must wait for further proof before we will hold him guilty of the Bonapartean views, which in not very “ambiguous voices,” are attributed to him.

In respect to the Colombian Government, it is undoubtedly in a state of partial disorganization. It is likewise true that Quito and Guayaquil, under a strong apprehension of the difficulties which surrounded them, have urgently requested Bolivar to act as supreme dictator. There is however one favourable feature in the condition of the country: a general solicitude for the public safety pervades all parties, apparently without the prevalence of very high party feeling.

Greece.—The last important measure in Greece, was at the city of Athens, which the Turks succeeded in capturing about the middle of August. They had besieged the place for some days, when the Greeks, having collected their forces, gave them battle. The Greeks were unsuccessful, and the place yielded to the enemy, with the exception it is said, of a strong and well provisioned citadel which remains in the possession of the besieged. Besides the loss of Athens, the Greeks appear to have suffered no military reverses. They are however represented as suffering greatly from want of the necessaries of life—more even from this cause, than from the direct operations of their cruel enemies. It extends to their women and children, no less than to the men in arms; and we are glad to notice that this feature of their sufferings is beginning to excite the sympathies and efforts of their

friends, both in Europe and in this country. Our countryman, Jarvis in a letter to Mr. Everett, of Congress, writes that “the Committees for the relief of the Greeks in France, Holland, and Geneva, have sent twelve cargoes of provisions, and an agent to superintend their distribution. This has prevented the final starvation of the country.” Meetings for a similar object have recently been held in Philadelphia, where one gentleman (whose name should be known) offers to give one third of a cargo of one thousand barrels of flour.

Constantinople.—The Sublime Porte lately issued a decree against sedition—in other words, against its subjects talking of “what’s done in the Cabinet.”

“Every person,” says the proclamation, “besides employing himself in his own affairs, and living honestly, ought incessantly to address his prayers to heaven for the life of him who is the shadow of the Almighty on earth, and whose munificence continually crowns his subjects with new benefits. But it must be remembered as notified, that after this day, all persons must abstain from circulating any false report, which may excite disturbance, to meddle with subjects in which they ought not to meddle, and thus to incur, in this world and the other, the wrath and the punishment of the Almighty.

“If any one shall neglect this notification, and shall disobey it—misfortune be to the transgressors, whoever they are! Be they men or women, they shall be seized; and the men shall be at the same instant punished in different places, to serve as an example to others—as for the women, they shall be strangled, and thrown into the sea.”

It is added in the French papers, that a large number of men and women have already suffered death under this decree; for, according to the firman, to say “This or that is to be done,” or “Things are going thus or thus,” is to be guilty of sedition.

Russia and Turkey.—The long protracted discussions respecting the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, have at length resulted in the acceptance of the Russian ultimatum, by

the Turkish commissioners at Akerman. By the convention thus entered into, these principalities will be restored to the condition of the distinct states. They will exercise their own government, religion, and laws; in a word, they will regulate their own affairs. They will however still be tributary to the Grand Seigneur, according to the conditions of the treaty which they were compelled to accede to in their former struggles with the Turks. They have always considered Russia as their natural protector.—Servia is also included in the late convention.

Russia and Persia.—A proclamation of war against Persia, was issued by the Emperor of Russia, on the 28th of September. Hostilities had previously commenced on the part of Persia, by an invasion of the Russian territory. The causes of the war are not distinctly understood. The Russian Emperor himself declares he cannot even divine them. He gives a sketch of the existing relations of the two powers, and of their negotiations since the peace of 1813: in all which nothing appears to justify the present rupture. At the close of his declaration however, the Emperor mentions that the emissaries of the Persian sovereign have excited his Mahometan subjects in the frontier provinces to revolt, and that Persian proclamations announce a *religious* war. This is the Russian view of the matter, but it is probable that something further remains to be known respecting it. In the mean time offensive operations are going forward on the part of Russia with the characteristic military energy of that nation.

Africa.—Dispatches received in England, mention another invasion of the British possessions in Africa by the Ashantees. They had come down in the month of August, in a body of 25,000, and were met by Col. Purdon with a force of 11,000, composed chiefly of native troops. The battle, which lasted an hour, and was at one time of doubtful issue, ended in the total rout of the Ashantees, who sustained a loss, in killed, wounded, and prisoners, estimated at 5000. The loss of Col. Purdon is stated at 800 killed and 2000 wounded.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A LOTTERY has been granted by the Georgia Legislature for the purpose of erecting a monument to Greene and Pulaski. A lottery for a similar purpose was granted at the last session of the Legislature of Connecticut, namely, the erection of a monument at Groton. Now it is undenied, and undeniable, that lotteries have a pernicious effect on the morals of the people. It would seem, therefore, that our wise legislators deem it more important to celebrate the virtues of the dead than to preserve the morals of the living. In our view, the granting of lotteries for such purposes is about as inconsistent with enlightened republican legislation as the sale of indulgencies to erect churches is consistent with the Christian religion. In both cases the policy adopted tends to destroy the foundation on which the institutions both of republicanism and Christianity rest.

The Royal Lottery of England, established in the reign of Queen Anne, made its last drawing on the 18th of October, when it was terminated.

The two hundred and sixth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth was celebrated at that place, and also at New-York, on the 22d of December.

The growth of our country may be seen from the rapid extension of the post-office system. Thirty-six years ago, (1790,) says the National Intelligencer, there were only seventy-five post-offices in the whole of the United States; their number now (1826) exceeds six thousand five hundred. The extent of post roads was then less than two thousand miles; they now exceed ninety thousand. The total amount of postages did not exceed thirty-eight thousand dollars; they are now more than twelve hundred thousand dollars. The transportation of the mails then cost about twenty-two thousand dollars annually; they now cost nearly eight hundred thousand dollars; and the compensation to post-masters has increased from eight thousand, to nearly four hundred thousand.

Meeting of Friends.—From the Address of the Yearly Meeting of Friends in North Carolina, held in November,

we take the following extract on the subject of the removal of their slaves to free governments.

"It appears from the proceedings of our meeting for sufferings, as presented to this Meeting, that there have been conveyed to free governments since last year, about 300 of the people of colour under the care of this Yearly Meeting; having been left to their choice of places. Upwards of 40 have been taken to Liberia; 119 to Hayti; 11 to Philadelphia; and the remainder to Ohio and Indiana: the expenses of which have been about \$3,500. About 600 are still remaining. It also appears that the following donations have been made us, to aid in this benevolent work: viz. \$2,914 16 cents from an individual in the city of Philadelphia; \$250 from the Yearly Meeting of New-York; \$1,000 from the Yearly Meeting of Rhode-Island; \$500 from the meeting for sufferings of Philadelphia; and \$100 from an individual of Burlington, New-Jersey. It further appears from the reports of the agents, that about 500 of the remaining people of colour are willing to emigrate to free governments;—upwards of 300 to Liberia; and the other 200 or thereabouts, to other places. All that is wanting are sufficient funds and opportunity. A donation of \$500 has been made by our meeting for sufferings, to the Colonization Society, to assist them in chartering a vessel the present fall, and 300 more pledged in case their funds should not be adequate. Although it appears from the above statement, that a part of our stock has not yet been expended, yet, it will fall far short of completing the operations in view, in regard to this momentous work. We have therefore cordially united in this Meeting, to endeavour to raise the sum of two thousand dollars: and although this is double what we directed last year, yet we think the importance of the subject, and the danger of delay, require it."

The Manumission Society of North Carolina embraces 47 branch societies, and about 2000 members.

The Governor of South Carolina, in his address to the Legislature, recommends that slaves be tried by jury in

capital cases, in a public manner, and that the masters have the right of challenging. The old and barbarous custom of capital punishment by burning, he recommends, should be abrogated.

The people of colour in Baltimore at a numerous meeting in the African church, on the 11th of December, adopted a Memorial to the white people of that city, respecting African emigration.

"We reside among you, (say they,) and yet are strangers; natives and yet not citizens: surrounded by the freest people and most republican institutions in the world, and yet enjoying none of the immunities of freedom.

Of the many schemes that have been proposed, we must approve of that of *African Colonization*. If we were able and at liberty to go wheresoever we would, the greater number, willing to leave this community, would prefer LIBERIA, on the coast of Africa.

The emigrants may readily be enabled to remove, in considerable numbers every fall; by a concerted system of individual contributions, and still more efficiently by the enactment of laws to promote their emigration, under the patronage of the State. The expense would not be nearly so great as it might appear at first sight; for when once the current shall have set towards Liberia, and intercourse grown frequent, the cost will of course diminish rapidly, and many will be able to defray it themselves. Thousands and tens of thousands, poorer than we, annually emigrate from Europe to your country, and soon have it in their power to hasten the arrival of those they left behind. Every intelligent and industrious coloured man would continually look forward to the day when he or his children might go to their veritable home, and would accumulate all his little earnings for that purpose."

A Liverpool paper states that there were 26,533 slaves embarked on board Brazilian vessels on the African coast between the first of July 1825, and the first of July 1826, for the Rio de Janeiro market. Of these poor creatures, 1,540 died on the passage; and 24,728 were landed at the Brazilian capital.

A petition to the French Government, last February, stated that "it is established by authentic documents, that the slave captains throw into the sea, every year, about *three thousand* negroes,—men, women, and children; of whom more than half are thus sacrificed while yet alive, either to escape from the visit of Cruizers, or because worn down by their sufferings, they could not be sold to an advantage."—The French are at length taking more decided measures for the suppression of the trade.

A fire broke out at Constantinople,

on the last of August, which raged unchecked for thirty hours, and destroyed a sixth part of the city.

The British Government has established a new town in one of the provinces ceded by the Burmese, by the name of Amherst, in honour of the Governor-General of that name. In company with the British authorities who left Rangoon, to assist at the establishment of the new town was Rev. Dr. Judson, of the American Mission. Selections were made from the 60th chapter of Isaiah.

ORDINATIONS AND INSTALLATIONS.

Sept. 20.—The Rev. SAMUEL W. MAY, over the Presbyterian church at Hoosick, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. Thomas Fletcher of Schaghticoke.

Oct. 13.—The Rev. ISAAC REED, over the Congregational church in Moriah, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. D. O. Morton.

Oct. 25.—The Rev. SAMUEL T. MILLS, over the Presbyterian church in Petersburg, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. J. Brown of Cazenovia.

Oct. 26.—The Rev. WILLIAM COLLINS, over the Baptist church in Chardon, Ohio. Sermon by the Rev. Jesse Hartwell.

Nov. 1.—The Rev. HENRY A. MERRILL, over the Congregational church in Norway. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Merrill of Otisfield.

Nov. 22.—The Rev. STEPHEN CROSBY, over the church in Granby, Mass.

Nov. 23.—The Rev. GEORGE SPRATT, over the Third Baptist church in Philadelphia. Sermon by the Rev. J. L. Daggett.

Dec. 1.—The Rev. AMASA JEROME,

as Pastor of the church in Wadsworth, Ohio. Sermon by the Rev. Giles H. Cowles.

Dec. 7.—The Rev. CYRUS MASON, over the Presbyterian church in Cedar Street, New-York. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. McAuley.

Dec. 12.—The Rev. CALVIN PARK, D.D., over the Congregational church in Stoughton. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Emmons of Franklin.

Dec. 13.—The Rev. JOEL MANN, over the First Church and Society in Suffield. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Vernon of Rehoboth.

Dec. 13.—The Rev. ASAHEL COBB was ordained at Rochester. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Codman of Dorchester.

Dec. 20.—The Rev. THOMAS T. WATERMAN, over the Union Congregational Church in Providence, R. I. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Beecher of Boston.

Dec. 27.—The Rev. EDWARD BEECHER, as pastor of Park Street Church in Boston. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Beecher, of Boston.